The Systems
of
Indian Philosophy

By

V. R. Gandhi, B.A., M.R.A.S.
Barrister-at-Law

Edited By

Dr. K. K. Dixit
Research Officer
L. D. Institute of Indology
Ahemdabad

Shri Mahavira Jaina Vidyalaya
Bombay 400 036

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

It was really a happy coincidence that a manuscript of a hitherto unpublished wok of Shri Virchand Raghavji Gandhi was discovered in his birth- place, Mahuva (Saurashtra), and that too in his centenary year. In his centenary your 1964, Shri Chandulal Vardhman Shah, one of us and Shri Kantilal Dahyabhai Kora, Registrar of Shri Mahavir Jaina *Vidyalaya* along with a past student Shri Pannalal R. Shah visited Mahuva. Their intention behind the visit was to collect from his birth- place the available material that can evoke the sacred memory of that eminent scholar and effective speaker. And we should say that the visit proved to be a pilgrimage. There they discovered and obtained certificates, writing, a silver casket and a gold medal along with two note-books containing the present lectures in his own hand-writing. It is really fortunate for us that these two note- books have been saved from destruction during a rather long period of 63 years even after the death of that scholar.

We handed over the note- books for perusal to Pt. Shri Dalsukhbhai Malavania, Director of Shri Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Bharatiya Sanskriti Vidyamandir and one of General Editors of Jains Agama Series along with Pujya Shri Punyavijayji Maharaj. While reading them, he found that they contained Shri V. R. Gandhi's illuminating lectures on the systems of Indian Philosophy. It is these lectures which Shri V. R. Gandhi delivered before American audience in attractive and popular style. Fearless and frank presentation of the subject-matter is the special feature of these lectures. Thus the present work containing them is really invaluable and the first of its kind. Hence we are very happy that it is published by our Institution.

It was very difficult to edit them critically on the basis of a handwritten manuscript and to print them in their pristine form. But the cooperation extended by Shri Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Bharatiya Sanskriti Vidyamandir, Ahmedabad, made our task very easy. Vidyamandir allotted the work of editing the lectures to Dr. K. K. Dixit, a scholar of many subjects and especially of philosophy. Dr. Dixit has taken great pains in carrying out the work successfully. We express our gratitude to the management of Vidyamandir for extending active cooperation. And we heartily thank Dr. Dixit for critically editing these lectures and for writing an elaborate thought-provoking introduction to the present work.

The evaluation of the present work, and its author has been made by Dr. Dixit in his impartial and scholarly introduction as also by Dr. Pt. Sukhlaji in his `Something About Late Shri V. R. Gandhi.' We know that one of the Factors that inspired him to write it, is his admiration for Shri V. R. Gandhi's academic activities. The original *Gujarati* of this English note is included in this work in order that the reader can have the benefit of reading Panditji's thoughts in his own words.

The late Shri Umedchand Dolatchand Barodia, a close associate of Shri Mahavira Jaina *Vidyalaya* for over 40 years, had assigned to the Institution his endowment paid-up insurance policy of Rs. 2,000/- in 1963 with a request to utilize the amount when realized for publications activities, as may be suggested by his two sons, Shri Shantibhai and Shri Kantibhai. On his death three years later, the two devoted sons who are past students of this Institution suggested that the insurance money may be utilized in the publication of the present book, whose author, Shri V. R. Gandhi was held in high esteem by their father as an outstanding representative of India at the Congress of World Religions in America and for his learned lectures in America and Europe. This suggestion coincided well with the devotion in which he held knowledge and religion.

Shri Umedchandbhai was born in Chuda, Saurashtra, in 1883 A.D. and was brought up in a atmosphere of education and culture. His father Shri Dolatchandbhai was one of the first Arts Graduates of the Bombay University and was the author of a number of books. Having such a laudable legacy of culture and knowledge, Shri Umedchandbhai had a distinguished career both at school and college. He won a University prize, besides being a

Dakshina Fellow at Gujarat College, Ahmedabad. He started his early career as a school-teacher, which he continued with zeal and admiration for nearly twenty years. After leaving the sphere of education, he became the Assistant Secretary of the Bombay Stock Exchange, which he continued till 1940, when he felt an urge to retire and have a spiritual solace. Later, he spent some years in religious studies and meditation at Shrimad Rajchandra Ashram, Agas along with his wife, who was a source of great inspiration in all his activities. After the death of his wife, he left Agas and returned to Bombay at the persuasion of his sons, a proposition, which he never cherished. He died at Bombay at the age of 83 on 11th February 1969.

During his stay in Bombay, Shri Umedchandbhai held in high esteem Acharya Shri Vijiyavallabhsuri, Whose Services to the cause of education, social welfare and Jainism has but few parallels in our history. This ideal brought him closer to Shri Mahavira Jaina *Vidyalaya*. Besides being a religious teacher and examiner of the students of *Vidyalaya*, he was member of managing Committee for many years. *Vidyalaya* remained his life-long interest and the progress of *Vidyalaya* was always near and dear to his heart.

The outstanding feature of his life was that he was a deeply religious man and was a devoted student of Jaina history, philosophy and literature. Education, devotion to duty, social service and spiritual practice were the strong attachments sustaining his life. He was the author of some books including the History and Literature of Jainism, besides contributing various articles to various journals. He edited also `Tarun Jain' and `Jain Herald' for some time.

The spontaneous help received from such a religious person in the publication of the present valuable work on philosophy is specially noteworthy and commendable.

Dr. N. J. Shah has corrected the proofs. And again it is he who has prepared the three useful indices. We express our sincere thanks to him. At last, our thanks are due to the Mouj Printing Bureau for the excellent printing.

August Kranti Marg	CHANDULAL VARDHMAN SHAH
(Gowalia Tank Road)	JAYANTILAL RATANCHAND SHAH
Bombay- 26	BALCHAND G. DOSHI
14-1-1970.	Hon. Secretaries.

SOMETHING ABOUT LATE SHRI V. R. GANDHI

`The Systems of Indian Philosophy' is published here for the first time. It contains lectures which late V. R. Gandhi delivered before American audience of the common people, while he was on his journey to attend the World Congress of Religions held for the first time in the United States of America in 1893 A.D.

The manuscript of the work, written in the author's own handwriting, remained unknown for very long. And fortunately it was discovered just in his centenary year. It is really a matter of happy co-incidence that Dr. K. K. Dixit, who himself is a sincere student of Indian and Western philosophy as well as a proficient scholar of ancient Indian language-Sanskrit, Prakrit, Pali, etc., has carefully edited the present work. It is an outstanding characteristic of Dr. Dixit that whatever he writes, he writes after mature consideration, without any partiality or exaggeration.

Dr. Dixit has written an elaborate introduction to this work. Any sensible Enquirer, who sincerely tries to understand it, will find no difficulty in properly evaluating these lectures. When I think on this line I feel that there remains nothing particular for me to write. But because I hold Gandhi in high esteem and because I have good faith in Shri Mahavira Jaina *Vidyalaya,* the Institute that publishes the present work, I am inspired to say few words.

For the last so many years, I have been hearing one harping note. It is this that the Jaina tradition should engage scholars to produce works on the cultural subjects like Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Art, etc. This note has originated from our special contact with the Western culture. But the Jaina tradition has formed the tendency that whatever the scholars write by themselves or whatever they write at the instance of others should all be published or got published in English. All the cultured Jainas who have got Western education uniformly, it has been noticed, desire that all the material pertaining to all the cultural aspects of the Jaina tradition should be made available in English. The desire is no doubt noble. But it has arisen mainly from the blind imitation of others and mental temperament devoid of deep understanding regarding publications in English language.

On the one hand, everywhere is evinced this noble desire for publishing or getting published the works in English, while on the had indifference is noticed towards the reading and study of the published English works which are capable of satisfying the thirst for knowledge, not only of the common people but also of the eminent scholars: if this contradiction is found among the business-minded Jaina laymen, there is no special cause of our getting disheartened; but if this defect is seen even among Jains ascetics who have pledged to devote themselves to the acquisition of knowledge, then we cannot but say that there is something wrong with the order of Jaina monks.

There are four sects of Jaina tradition. We may take consolation in thinking that there is no cause for complaining much against the three sects other than the idol-worshipping Svetambara one. But it is this idol worshipping Svetambara sect that sent Shri Gandhi to

America as a representative of the entire Jaina tradition. And about 75 years before, he successfully fulfilled this mission there. Moreover, he wrote such works in English relating to Jaina tradition as is written by no other Indian - especially Jaina-scholar even to this day. But alas! Rarely do we find the deserving English-knowing persons who read and study these works.

Gandhi's works pertaining to the three subjects related to Jain tradition have been published before many years; and the standard of these works is so high that no author, as far as I understand, has reached that standard in producing works pertaining to those subjects. Jaina Yoga (mysticism), Jaina Philosophy and Jaina *Karma* doctrine are the three subjects, which Gandhi presented in English with depth and clarity. If at least some solitary ascetic or monk had studied these works, then he would have made a considerable contribution to the fund of knowledge in possession of the Jainas, would have translated or got translated them into Hindi, Gujarati and other Indian languages and thus would have finally helped us in giving a new mould to the curriculum of the *Pathasalas* (institutions conduction classes of Religion and Philosophy) conducted by Jaina tradition.

Were I to tell my own story, I should say that I heard the name of Shri V. R. Gandhi from no *Pannyasa*, no scholar and no *Acarya* except the late Vijayavallabhsuriji, who belonged to idol-worshipping Svetambara tradition. When they knew not even the name of Shri V. R. Gandhi then what to talk of his works!

Today this narrow-mindedness has almost disappeared. So first I suggest that the faithful translation of all the three works into Hindi, Gujarati and other Indian languages should be published without delay. And they should be included in the curriculum of the classes of Religion and Philosophy, conducted by the Jaina tradition. Only then the mind of the new generation would become broad-based instead of becoming narrow, as also the student of the neglected *Pathasalas* will assume some luster resulting from this knowledge.

This publication embodying a collection of lectures on six systems of Indian Philosophy is really important not only for the Jaina scholars but also for other Indian and non-Indian scholars. It is important for three reasons: first, they were addressed to the educated common people of America, by a representative of Jaina tradition, who was above all sectarian spirit. Secondly they reveal the author's deep and extensive study of the subject; and their presentation is natural. Thirdly, English language in which they are written is pure and pristine to such extent that even the learned editor has found no scope for any correction.

These lectures on the systems of Indian philosophy should be translated into Hindi as early as possible so that the students of different levels can understand them. In short, then only the students can avail of the faithful presentation of the subject, which they need most. Moreover, the study of these lectures will prove fruitful to them for the further study of the voluminous works on the subject.

On the auspicious occasion of the birth-day celebration of Venerable Vijayanandasurishvaraji (Venerable Atmaramji Maharaj), revered Vijayavallabhasuri often praised Gandhi in glowing terms spontaneously coming from his own personal experience. He used to say that wonderful were the grasping power and politeness of Gandhiji. And it is on that account that he learnt what was essential from Venerable Atmaramaji Maharaj within a short time. And he duly utilized in America the knowledge thus acquired. But from the talks of revered Vijayavallabhasuri about Gandhi, it emerges that he had no knowledge of these six lectures. He talked only about the above-mentioned three works pertaining to Jaina tradition. Now that we are celebrating the centenaries of Gandhi and *Acarya ji*, Shri Mahavira Jaina *Vidyalaya* should carry out all this work remaining incomplete or untouched. This is what is desired.

Lastly, it is necessary to note some characteristics of Gandhi. First, he was a good scholar of Sanskrit. This is the reason, why he could properly understand all the systems of Indian philosophy, and this is again the reason why he rightly and fearlessly suggested the Christians of America, to ponder over the question as to, whether the missionaries or priests they sent to India conduct their proselytizing activities adopting any method and means or with proper understanding of Indian culture. Really speaking those missionaries sent to India, says Gandhi, should learn Sanskrit; otherwise they will not properly understand Indian culture and hence they will present the Indian culture in a distorted form. Here we are reminded of Mahatma Gandhi ji's fearless advice to the Christian missionaries about their proselytizing activities. His second characteristics is that he read, with full concentration, the writings of mature Indological scholars of different countries, Germany, etc. And in the preparation of his lectures he fully utilized their writings. This is the reason why his lectures are impartial and faithful. The third thing, which is noteworthy, is his association with Mahatma Gandhiji. On the one hand Mahatma ji started the study of Law and on the other he commenced his experiments on food. As is referred to by Mahatma ji in his autobiography (Pt. II chapter 3, p.56) Shri V. R. Gandhi joined him in his experiments on food in those days. If Mahatma ji had not referred to this story, we would have remained in complete darkness about the personal relationship between the two Gandhis of Saurashtra. Lastly, I should refer to Shri V.R.Gandhi's courageous spirit as also in his vision of the future. At that time in one of his lectures addressed to the American public he declared: "You know, my brothers and sisters, that we are not an independent nation, we are subjects of her Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria, the 'Defender of the Faith'. But if we were a nation in all that that name implies, with our government and our own rulers, with our laws and institutions controlled by us free and independent, I affirm that we should seek to establish and for ever maintain peaceful relations with all nations of the world. "The prophetic words are as if echoed in the thoughts of Mahatma ji.

Sarit Kunj,Ahmedabad 9 SUKHLAL 24- 12- 1969
SANGHAVI

CONTENTS

12. Some further details concerning *prakriti's* evolution

13. The doctrine of a gross and a subtle body

14. The means of moksa

15. The nature of moksa

16. The advocacy of the idea of nature working under fixed laws

17. The advocacy of the idea of `liberation of all'

18. Three points of criticism by way of conclusion

II The Yoga Philosophy

1. Introductory; the mutual relationship between the physical, psychological, moral and spiritual planes (in Yoga and in the other systems of Indian philosophy)

2. The concept of mind (*citta*) introduced

3. Various views as to the nature of mind enumerated and the *Sankhya* concept of *sattvapatti*, *Moksa* or *kaivalya* explained

4. *Yoga* Posits God over and above the *Sankhya* philosophy's 25 elements

5. As contrasted to *Sankhya yoga* is highly practical in character

6. Yoga understood as *citta -vrtti - nirodha*

7. The five types of *citta -vrtti -nirodha*

8. *Vairagya* and *abhyasa* the means of *citta*

9. Incidental criticism of those denying the possibility of extra -sensory knowledge

10. As a result of *yoga* soul controls the mind rather than vice versa

11. The two types of *samadhi* and the eight stages that lead thereto

12. (a) Five *yams*

(b) Five *Niyam*

13. (a) The results of five *yams*
(b) The results of five *Niyam*

14. *Asanas*

15. *Pranayam*

16. *Pratyahara*

17. *Dhahran*

18. *Dhyana*

19. *Samadhi*

20. The mutual relationship between *Dhahran*, *Dhyana* and *Samadhi* (collectively called *Samyama*)

21. The mutual relationship between the five *yoga- bahirangas*, the three *yoga- Antaranga* and the final *samadhi*

22. The precise nature of the *citta-prename* occurring during the stage of final *samadhi*

23. The general concepts of *Dharma -Parinaama*, *laksana- Parinaama* and *avastha-Parinaama*

24. The result of the *Samyama* with the three fold *Parinaama* for its object

25. The result of the *Samyama* with word etc. for its object

26. The result of the *Samyama* with mental impressions for its object

27. The result of the *Samyama* with sign etc. for its object

28. The result of the *Samyama* with the form of one's body for its object

29. The result of the *Samyama* with *Karma* for its object

30. The result of the *Samyama* with *maitri*, *karana*, *upeksa* for its object

31. The result of the *Samyama* with the elephant, the *Satva -parkas*, the sun, the moon,

the polar star for its object

32. The result of the *Samyama* with the bodily parts (i.e. *Nabhi -cakra* etc.) for its object

33. The result of the *Samyama* with purusa for its object

34. The result of the *Samyama* with *pranas* (i.e. *udana* etc.) for its object

35. The result of the *Samyama* with the ether ear relationship and the ether-body relationship for its object

36. Non-attachment to the above miraculous powers is the ideal

37. How the yogin assumes different bodies (incidentally, how a being's act yield result)

38. How the *yogin* attains *kaivalya*

III The *Naya* philosophy

1. Introductory; the precise relationship between the *Naya* and *Vaisesika*

2. The *Naya* notion of *uddesa*, *laksana* and *pariksa*

3. The sixteen *Naya* topics explained

4. Transition to the *Vaisesika*

5. The seven *Vaisesika* Categories enumerated

6. The seven *Vaisesika* Categories further elaborated:

7. The *Vaisesika* Categories further elaborated:

(a) The *Dravyas* that are both eternal and non-eternal
(b) The *Dravyas* that are eternal

IV *Mimamsa*

1.To be neglected inasmuch as it is not system of philosophy but rather a system of

ritualism

V *Vedanta* Philosophy

1. The *Upanisadic* basis of the *Vedanta* philosophy laid bare with the help of the *Uddalaka- Svetaketu* dialogue of the *Chhandogya Upanisad*

2. The mutual relationship between *Mimamsa* and *Vedanta*

3. A summary account of *Sankara's* version of *Vedanta*:
(a) The nature of *Brahma, Maya and Jagat* (both *Jan˙* and *Chaitan*) (b) The nature of bondage
(c) The nature of *moksa*

4. A summary account of Ramanuj's version of *Vedanta*:
(a) The nature of Brahma and *Jagat* (both *Jan˙* and *Chaitana*)
(b) The nature of bondage and moksa

5. Sankara and Ramanuja compared and contrasted

6. Further elaboration of Sankara's view:
(a) *Sankar* on Brahma's causality of the world
(b) The gradual development of Sankara's philosophy out of the old Upanisads
(c) Brahma and Brahma
(d) For Sankara the *jiva* is Brahma (not Brahma) and it is Brahma (not becomes Brahma)

(e) Sankara's view contrasted with that of *Yoga*
(f) Sankara explains away-and with ease the Upanisadic passage where they speak as if the *jiva* and *Jagat* too are independent realities (like Brahma)
(g) Vedanta-lie all idealism-goes against commonsense
(h) Vedanta accepts the idea of God and of His worship-from a practical stand- point
(i) The knowledge had from the practical standpoint is supplanted by that had from the ultimate standpoint.
(j) Only *Sata*, *Chaitan* and *Ananda* can be attributed to the highest Brahma (that can be known only as subject but never as an object)
(k) But the creation of the world on the part of Brahma, an individual's individuality, the worship of Brahma on the part of individual are all `practical truths not falsehoods
(l) Various analogies to explain Brahma's causality of the world ultimately replaced by Sankara's doctrine of *vivarta*
(m) Brahma's causality of the world is case of *Avidya* (i.e. a case of appearance caused by ignorance)
(n) Bharatitratha on the mechanism of removing *Avidya*

VI *Buddhi*sm

1. Introductory; the Indian scene as Buddha found it

2.Some biographical details relating to Buddha

3. The doctrine of *Buddha*
(a) Northern *Buddhi*sm
(b) Southern *Buddhi*sm
(c) The three *Pitakas* of Southern *Buddhi*sm
(d-e) The four `noble truths':
(d) The first `noble truth': (incidental account of five *skandhas* and a refutation of the doctrine of soul)
(e) The second, third and fourth `noble truths'
(f) Recapitulation of the *Buddhi*st system of morality under seven heads
(g) *Nirvana*- the ultimate result of `Self-culture'
(h) Buddha's agnosticism as to what happens after death to him who has attained *nirvana*

(i) Buddha's acceptance of the `doctrine of *Karma*' by way of explaining as to what happens after death to him who has not attained *nirvana*
(j) Buddha on Brahmanical gods
(k) Buddha on Case-system
(l) Buddha on Vedic ritualism
(m) Buddha on philosophical discussion (and the rise of a *Buddhi*st philosophy)
(n) The early form of *Buddhi*st worship
(o) The history of *Buddhi*sm after Buddha

VII Jainism

1. The poser of four questions that are basic to all investigation into a philosophical system

2. Jainism on the nature of universe

3. Jainism on the nature of God

4. (a) Jainism on the nature of soul
(b) Jainism on the destiny of soul

5. Jainism on the doctrine of *Karma*

ABBREVIATIONS

SS - *Sankhya Sutras*
SK - *Sankhya Karika*
Ani. - *Aniruddha*'s Commentary on SS
Vijn. - *Vijnanabhiksu's* Commentary on SS
YS - *Yoga Sutras*
Vy. - *Vyas's* commentary on YS
HP- *Hatha-yoga-pradipika*
NS- *Naya Sutras*
VS - *Vedanta Sutras*

INTRODUCTION

Here we have a lecture series dealing with the systems of Indian Philosophy and delivered by V. R. Gandhi in 1894 at Chicago. These lectures are important as much because they deal with the systems of Indian Philosophy as because V. R. Gandhi delivered them. For V. R. Gandhi (who was born in 1864 and died young in 1901) was one of the extraordinary Indians of his time. He was a born Jaina and (what is more noteworthy) a convinced Jaina, and it was as representative of the Jaina sect that he took part in the Parliament of Religions held at Chicago in 1893 (better known to most of us on account of Swami Vivekananda's participation in it). But few Jainas before and after him would equal him in their capacity to make the Jaina positions comprehensible to a non-Jaina audience and in their capacity to adopt a most non-sectarian approach while dealing with a problem. Gandhi's many lectures meant to undertake an exposition of the various aspects of Jainism (and his article "Philosophy and Psychology of the Jains" published in Mind Vol. I, No. 4)-most of them available to us in the collection published under the title "The Jaina Philosophy"- can well form for those who know English a best introduction to this branch of studies in Indian culture. Particularly noteworthy in this connection are the lectures (delivered in England) dealing with the Jaina doctrine of *Karma*. The verbatim notes of these lectures- which were in possession of H. Warren and were probably taken down by himself- were later on published under the title "The *Karma* Philosophy". V. Glasenapp, the recognized Western authority on Jainism in general and the Jaina doctrine of *Karma* in particular, duly acknowledges his indebtedness to these lectures of Gandhi which even today remain an independent source of enlightenment on the subject in spite of the Gedrman scholar's doctoral dissertation devoted to the same. The "doctrine of *Karma*", subscribed to by the Vedicists, *Buddhi*sts, Jainas and numerous other religious sects of India, holds a crucial importance in the development of the characteristic ethical notions of the ancient Indians, and the Jaina version of it is illuminating in more ways than one. It is

really a pity that even so lucid an exposition of the Jaina doctrine of *Karma* as was undertaken by Gandhi remains unread even by those who otherwise evince sincere and serious interest in the problems of Indian ethics.

Of course, in order to derive best advantage out of Gandhi's writings things will have to be looked from Gandhi's standpoint. There are times when Gandhi speaks as a Jaina, times when he speaks as a Hindu, times when he speaks as an Indian, and times when he speaks as a plain man. While speaking as a Jaina, a Hindu, or an Indian, Gandhi is in most cases positive in his assertions, that is, he mostly brings to the fore the merits of the case he is advocating; but occasionally he is forced to come out sometimes sharply enough against what he considers to be a gross misunderstanding of his case on somebody's part. He is bitterest in his condemnation of the Christian missionaries, come to India from abroad to propagate their cult. But his motives in doing so are extremely mixed. Gandhi is against the Christian missionaries because the latter consider the Hindu to be ethically degraded. Now Gandhi would not answer this slander by talking ill of Christians en masse, not only because he had nothing, but praise for what he considered to be Christ's true teaching, but also because he had come to cultivate warm friendship with a vast number of noble-minded Christians both in England and in America. Gandhi therefore took care to distinguish between the ordinary Christian residing in England or America and the Christian missionaries who come to India from abroad; in his lectures like "India's Message to America" and "Impressions of America" he paid handsome tributes to the former, in those like "Have Christian Missions to India been Successful?" he cursed the latter. As an Indian Gandhi was painfully conscious of his country's dependent status as also of the economic exploitation this country was subjected to, but his observations on these matters are mostly in the form of obiter dicta. For example, in the course of his "India's Message to America" he makes bold to say: "You know, my brothers and sisters, that we are not an independent nation; we are subjects of Her Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, the 'defender of the faith', but if we were a nation in all that that name implies, with our own government and our own rulers, with our laws and institutions controlled by us free and independent, I affirm that we should seek to establish and for ever maintain peaceful relations with all the nations of the world" (The Jaina Philosophy, p. 264). A still more revealing passage-occurring in "Have Christian Missions to India been Successful?"- runs as follows: "Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard all yours lives from your missionaries who claim to be the messengers of God how ugly, wretched, immoral, and vile the heathen Indians are; . . . but did you ever hear from these missionaries-the messengers of love to all mankind-of the tyrannies that are perpetrated over the Hindus in India? Government has abolished duties on fine dry goods from Liverpool and Manchester for the purpose of finding a good market in India and has levied a 200 per cent tax on the manufacture of salt in India to maintain a costly government. Did they ever tell you about all such things? If they have not, whose messengers you will call these people, who always side with tyranny, who throw their cloak of hypocritical religion over murderers and all sorts of criminals who happen to belong to their religion or to their country?" (The Jaina Philosophy, pp. 85-86). Thus Gandhi dreamt of an India politically and economically independent but he

was intelligent enough to see that there was no immediate prospect of his dream coming true. On the other hand, what might be called India's "religious independence" was a glowing reality before Gandhi's eyes and he was extremely anxious lest this too should gradually become extinct. Hence his tirade against the Christian missionaries. Let us however not forget that Gandhi's chief weapon in the struggle for what was in his eyes his country's "religious survival" was positive rather than negative. That is to say, Gandhi was interested not so much in saying things against the Christian missionaries as in saying things in favor of India's cultural heritage, a heritage to which his own Jaina community had made no mean contribution.

This background to Gandhi's activities explains, why he always spoke with the zeal of a missionary. But significantly enough, in Gandhi's mental make-up there was also a scholarly side and the best literary specimens, where he comes out as a beautiful blend of the missionary, and the scholar are his lectures pertaining to Jainism-particularly those related to the Jaina doctrine of *Karma*. A specimen belonging to the same group is his present lecture-series dealing with the systems of Indian philosophy. However, this series has certain specific features of its own, and it is to these that we turn our attention next.

The task of interpreting the systems of Indian Philosophy is beset with two sets of problems, one having to do with the nature of the subject-matter in question and the other with what happens to be the general standpoint of the interpreter concerned. To take the two sets one by one. The major part of India's philosophical literature is in Sanskrit, some in Prakrit and some in Pali; and almost no texts that claim attention in this connection are a modern composition. Thus a student of Indian philosophy has not only to master a language like Sanskrit (preferably, Prakrit and Pali as well) but he has also to learn the art of placing himself in the position of an ancient or a medieval Indian. It is only after fulfilling these two rather irksome requirements that one would find it possible to rightly understand what a particular system of Indian philosophy says on this or that problem it has cared to investigate. And then comes the question of offering interpretations to what has been taught by a system of Indian Philosophy, interpretations that are bound to differ in case they happen to be offered by students whose own ideological affiliations are mutually different. Of course, the ideological affiliation of an interpreter of Indian Philosophy (for that matter, of any philosophy whatsoever) need not bear a recognized 'label' but it should be something precisely definable nevertheless. For example, the general standpoint of Radhakrishnan (and of those numerous prominent Indian authors who have followed his lead) can rightly be called *Advaita Vedantic*, but it will be somewhat difficult to give a name to the general standpoint of a Max Muller or a Deussen. But both Max Muller and Deussen were good Christians deeply in sympathy with Kant, and the fact is largely responsible for the way they have handled the problems of Indian Philosophy. Certainly, a Western movement for the study of Indian Philosophy headed by persons like Max Muller and Deussen, could not but present the Advaita Vedanta of Sankara in the most favorable light, and judge each and every other systems of Indian Philosophy on the basis of the distance that separates it from this Advaita Vedanta, a procedure essentially

the same as was subsequently followed by Radhakrishnan and others in India. This circumstance is a good deal responsible for the somewhat lop-sided development of the studies related to Indian Philosophy that have been conducted in the West and in India in the course of past hundred years or so. Gandhi's keen eyes could see the danger inherent in the situation, as should be evident from the following comment he made (in his article published in Mind) by way of taking mild exception to a statement occurring in the Prospectus of the newly founded journal that was to acquire a big name afterwards: "This statement seems to whisper in my ears that Hindu metaphysics has not been able to offer the right solution of the various intricate problems of life that are staring in the face of the Western thinkers. By "Hindu" is meant, of course, the special phase of Vedanta philosophy that has been presented to the people of West during the last four years. I am glad that the truth in Vedanta has come to the shores of this country. It would have been much better if the whole truth lying back of the different sectarian systems of India had been presented, so that a complete instead of a partial view of India's wisdom might have satisfied the craving of deep students." (The Jaina Philosophy, p. 14). Be that as it may, the systems of Indian Philosophy can be fruitfully studied also from a Western standpoint different from that of Kant and from an Indian standpoint different form that of Sankara. Nay, it is doubtless desirable that these systems be studied from the various standpoints that dominate the Western philosophical scene as also from those that dominate the Indian philosophical scene. Gandhi's present lectures on the systems of Indian Philosophy are important inasmuch as they give us an idea of how a liberal Jaina looks at-and places before an American audience-the philosophical heritage of his motherland.

Gandhi well realized that grounding in Sanskrit is indispensable for one seeking to know something of India's past glory. That is why he once argues: "The many learned missionary gentlemen who have written or who have exhausted their oratory power in denouncing India, can only prove their claim to be an authority when they show their knowledge of the Hindu religion, and this can only be proven by their knowledge of Sanskrit. When they can converse with me in this language I Shal consider their words worthy of consideration and not before". ("Have Christian Missions, etc.", The Jaina Philosophy, p. 86) Of course, Gandhi was not only not blind to the existence of Western Sanskritists but was himself a personal friend of good many of them; (what he was there criticizing was the ignorant debunking of things Indian on the part of the Christian missionaries come from abroad). Not only that, he actually made best use of the English translations done by Western scholars of the Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali texts, though when need arose, he would prepare his own English version of an Indian text passage that was in no way inferior to that of the best translators of those days. As a matter of fact, Gandhi's general mastery over English language was strikingly perfect. However, a thorough grounding in Sanskrit and a good command over English would not have sufficed for Gandhi's need; what he above all required was a capacity to grasp the spirit of the teaching imparted by an ancient Indian text, he took up for study. And with this capacity too Gandhi was endowed in good measure. A ringing confirmation of this comes from his present lectures on the systems of Indian Philosophy, where we find him taking great pains to tell us just, what a Sankhya

Philosopher, a Yoga Philosopher, a *Naya-Vaisesika* Philosopher, a Vedanta Philosopher or a *Buddhi*st Philosopher has to say on this or that question. Of course, the very fact that Gandhi chooses to discuss certain topics and not others in the course of his treatment of a particular system of Indian Philosophy betrays his own likes and dislikes; the more so is the case with the critical remarks he now and then passes against a non-Jaina system. But that has to be the feature of all principled exposition of the tenets of Indian Philosophy (for that matter, of any philosophy whatsoever); and Gandhi was certainly a man of principles. What we are emphasizing is that Gandhi's own ideological affiliation did no prevent him from making maximum effort to get at the heart of the various positions developed by the various non Jaina systems of Indian Philosophy. In his lecture on Jainism-which is the last lecture in the present series- Gandhi enumerates what he considers to be the four questions basic to all philosophical investigation; they are:

(i) What is the nature of the universe?
(ii) What is the nature of God?
(iii) What is the nature and what the destiny of soul?
(iv) What are the laws of the soul's life?

[the questions (iii) and (iv) are closely related, the former inquiring about the general nature of a soul, its bondage and its liberation, the later *inquiring* about the functioning of the "law of *Karma*"]. And his exposition of Jainism is in the form of a discussion of the Jaina answer to these four questions. In the case of the rest of the systems there is no ordered treatment of these questions, but there too Gandhi is always taking up one or another from among these very questions (which is but to be expected in view of Gandhi's understanding of what constitutes a philosophical investigation being what it is). And it should not be difficult for an intelligent reader to make out for himself how this or that system differs from Jainism on this or that question. But Gandhi, almost totally unmindful of this difference, continues his painstaking works of exposition. As for the points of criticism occasionally raised against a non-Jaina system they seem to have been balanced by an occasionally showered praise. In any case, Gandhi is not obsessed by the fact that each of the non-Jaina systems considered by him differs from Jainism more or less sharply on some questions or others.

Let us now take critical note of the facts about Indian Philosophy that Gandhi thought fit to convey to his American audience and of his manner of doing so Gandhi has taken up for consideration the following systems: *Sankhya*, Yoga, *Naya* (and *Vaisesika*). *Mimamsa*, *Vedanta*, *Buddhism* and *Jainism*. And it will be convenient and useful for us to discuss his treatment of these systems one by one.

1. SANKHYA

Gandhi bases his account of the Sankhya system on the version of it that we find in the Sankhya *Sutras* (a version not essentially different from that found in the Sankhya Karika

and one entitled to be treated as 'Classical Sankhya'). Students of Indian Philosophy attach importance to the Sankhya system for diverse-nay, mutually opposite-reasons. Those inclined to favor idealism (if the Advaita Vedanta type, say) emphasize the fact that according to Sankhya the world of day-to-day experience (in it capacity as an evolute of *Prakrit*) is real to a soul-in-bondage (i.e. a soul-under-ignorance) but unreal to an emancipated (i.e an enlightened) soul; those inclined to favor realism emphasize the fact that according to Sankhya *prakriti*, the root-cause of the world of day-to-day experience, is a reality co-eternal with the multiplicity of souls.

As a matter of fact, the Sankhya philosopher's position on the question is considerably obscure, it being really difficult to make out as to what he precisely means by his thesis that *prakriti* evolves itself in the form of the world of day-to-day experience for a soul that is in bondage while it ceases to do so for a soul that is emancipated. With this obscurity in the background we can easily follow Gandhi's account of the Sankhya system. Gandhi gives prominence to the Sankhya philosopher's contention that the world of day-to-day experience evolved out of *prakriti* is not an illusory appearance and that the souls are many in number, a contention directed against two fundamental theses of Advaita Vedanta. But he raises pointed objection against the Sankhya position that *Buddhi* ('intellect' in Gandhi's translation) is a product of *prakriti* (which in turn is a physical entity) while *ahankara* ('self-consciousness' in Gandhi ji's translation) is a product of *Buddhi*. The functions that the Sankhya philosopher assigns to *Buddhi* and *ahankara* will be assigned to soul by Gandhi (rather by the Jaina philosopher) and the latter must have noted that the former's way of speaking paves the way for the Advaita Vedantist's dismissal of a soul's individuality as an illusory appearance. For *Buddhi* and *ahankara* represent the essence of an individual's individuality, and if they have nothing to do with soul the conclusion certainly follows that soul has nothing to do with an individual's individuality; and this conclusion couple with the thesis that all physical phenomena whatsoever are illusory naturally leads to the Advaita Vedanta position that the sole existing reality is one soul. Of course, Gandhi must have also realized that the functions attributed by the *Sankhya* philosopher to *Buddhi* and *ahankara* cannot be the functions of a physical entity (as *Buddhi* and *ahankara* allegedly are), for to concede that possibility will mean embracing materialism. Be that as it may, Gandhi made an honest attempt to place before his audience the picture of an Indian system of philosophy that is partly idealist, partly realist, partly materialist. And if it is the realistic aspects of the Sankhya teaching that chiefly received Gandhi's attention it is not because Gandhi was himself a realist but because the 'classical Sankhya' is actually a realistic system of philosophy on the whole. One more point. Gandhi well observed that in an Indian system of philosophy the metaphysical and ethic -religious matters invariably go hand in hand, but he also knew that the importance attached to these two in different systems is differently proportioned. And consequently in his exposition of a system of Indian Philosophy Gandhi would endeavor to remain loyal to the spirit of the original in this respect. Thus he treated Sankhya as a philosophical system chiefly devoted to theoretical problems while touching upon the problems of practice as well; (on the contrary, he treated the *Yoga* of *Patanjali* as a

philosophical system chiefly devoted to practical problems while touching upon the problems of theory as well). That is why Gandhi begins his lecture on Sankhya by telling us that the Sankhya philosopher aims at a cessation of the threefold miseries while in the course of his exposition he incidentally tells us as to what according to the Sankhya philosopher is the nature of *moksa* and what the means of attaining it, for the rest his concern is with the metaphysical tenets of the Sankhya system.

2. YOGA

Gandhi rightly noted that the *Yoga* system of philosophy- more properly, the system of philosophy propounded by *Pantanjali* in his *Yoga Sutras*- differs but little from Sankhya so far as theoretical questions are concerned; what distinguishes Yoga is its over-all preoccupation with practical matters. Hence we find Gandhi too almost exclusively discussing practical matters throughout his lecture on Yoga. But the practical matters taken into consideration by the Yoga system are of a somewhat peculiar nature. The Yoga philosopher (rather the Yoga adept) aims at developing the capacity to concentrate his mind on one subject of the exclusion of everything else-and ultimately to concentrate it on `nothing'. A rough equivalent for `concentration of mind' is `cessation of mental modifications (*Skt. Citta vrtti- nirodha*)' and whatever theoretical problems interest a Yoga philosopher mostly arise in the course of his inquiry into the precise nature of *citta*, *citta-vrtti* and *citta-vrtti-nirodha*. For the rest he is busy discussing the practical measures to be devised in order to develop the capacity for `concentration of mind' (or discussing the miraculous capacities that a practicing *yogi* allegedly comes to acquire). Gandhi's exposition of *Yoga* therefore begins with a brief account of *citta*, *citta-vrtti* and *citta-vrtti-nirodha*; then is considers the nature of the eight *yogangas* (or `means of yoga'- i.e., means for developing the capacity for concentration of mind), and lastly the miraculous capacities that one allegedly comes to acquire as a result of concentrating one's mind on this object or that. Now the first two *yogangas* happen to be *yam* and *niYams* (in Gandhi's translation `forbearances' and `observances') and the various sub-species of them happen to be various virtues of character. Thus the five *yams* are `abstaining from killing (*ahimsa*)', `abstaining from falsehood (*satya*)', `abstaining from theft (*asteya*)', `austerity (tapas)', `study (*svadhyaya*)' and `resignation to God (*Isvarapranidhana*)'. Hence the consideration of these two *yogangas* provided Gandhi a good opportunity to express his views on a number of ethical questions. Of course, in his exposition Gandhi did not want to deviate from what was actually said or implied in the *Yoga* writings; but when he found that a particular position adopted by the *Yoga* philosopher was not worth dilating upon he simply mentioned it and passed on. This attitude becomes particularly striking in the later parts of his exposition- that is, in the course of his exposition of the remaining six *yogangas* and of the miraculous capacities allegedly acquired by a practicing *yogin*. In these parts we are able to know a good deal as to what the Yoga philosopher has to say on the questions under consideration but pretty little as to what Gandhi himself feels about the matter. But one thing is certain. In his own way Gandhi was thoroughly convinced that as a result of controlled `concentration of mind' (and the allied yoga exercises) one can come

to acquire supra-normal capacities of body and mind; this becomes clear not only from the occasional comments made by him in the course of his present lecture on Yoga philosophy but also from his numerous other lectures on the subject of yoga which were later on published under the title `The Yoga Philosophy'. Perhaps, Gandhi would not therefore endorse the following stricture passed by Max Muller against that part of the Yoga *Sutras* where the miraculous powers allegedly acquired by a practicing *yogi* are enumerated: ``... we get more and more into superstitions, by no means without parallels in other countries, but for all that, superstitions which have little claim on the attention of the philosopher, however interesting they may appear to pathologist", (The six systems of Indian philosophy, p. 351). But then Max Muller had himself gone on to add; ``These matters, though trivial, could not be passed over, whether we accept them as hallucinations to which, as we know, our thinking organ (organs?) are liable, or whether we try essential part on *yoga* philosophy and it is certainly noteworthy even from a philosophical point of view, that we find such vague and incredible statements side by side with the specimens of the most exact reasoning and careful observation" (Ibid., p. 352) Moreover, the acquisition of miraculous capacities was not considered even by Gandhi to be the true aim of yoga practice; for in his eyes this aim was `self-culture' as he understood it.

3. *NAYA* (AND *VAISESIKA*)

For reasons partly technical and partly ideological the *Naya-Vaisesika* system yet remains `under-studied' by the students of Indian Philosophy-Indian as well as Western. On account of their logical rigor- as also on account of their highly evolved technical terminology -even the elementary *Naya-Vaisesika* texts are tough enough to scare the novice. Another reason for the comparative neglect of the system lies in the content of its teaching. The *Naya-Vaisesika* philosophy is a type of empirical realism and as such it is opposed to the transcendental idealism of Advaita Vedanta- the system patronized by a majority of scholars working the field of Indian philosophy. Max Muller's attitude was typical. "While in the systems hitherto examined," he says, "particularly in the *Vedanta*, *Sankhya* and *Yoga*, there runs a strong religious and even poetical vein, we now come to two systems, *Naya* and *Vaisesika*, which are very dry and unimaginative, ... businesslike exposition of what can be known, either of the world which surrounds us or of the world within..." (The Six Systems, p. 362). Gandhi, who was himself a man of deeply religious temperament, and who must have been alive to the fact that the *Naya-Vaisesika* system pays scant heed to the problems of ethics and religion, could not ditto Max Muller's sweeping condemnation of the system, not only because the condemnation was so sweeping but also because Gandhi's own general philosophical standpoint was realistic rather than idealistic. But as things stood, Gandhi did not think it worthwhile to say much (maybe he had not think it worthwhile to say much (maybe he had not much to say) about the philosophical teachings of the *Naya-Vaisesika* system, and what we have from his pen is a barest outline of the sixteen topics (technically called *Padarthas*) whose consideration exhausts what may be called the *Naya* philosophy and of the seven categories (again, technically called *Padarthas*) whose consideration exhausts what may be called a

Vaisesika philosophy.

4. *MIMAMSA*

Gandhi did not consider *Mimamsa* to be a system of philosophy but a system of ritualism, and that is why he just takes note of it and then passes on to the system to be taken up next. As a matter of fact, *Mimamsa* is both a system of philosophy and a system of ritualism. But the philosophical literature emanating from the *Mimamsa* school belongs to the same broad category (and broadly presents the same type of difficulties before a student) as does that emanating from the *Naya*-*Vaisesika* school. Nay, a serious study of the *Naya*-*Vaisesika* philosophy is impossible without a serious study of the *Mimamsa* philosophy (just as it is impossible without a serious study of the *Buddhi*st philosophy as expounded by the school of Dinnaga and Dharmakirti). Be that as it may, we too take leave of *Mimamsa* and proceed on the Vedanta.

5. VEDANTA

Gandhi's account of the Vedanta philosophy is most illuminating and for various reasons. Neither in the case of *Sankhya*-*Yoga*, nor in that of Naya-*Vaisesika* (nor in that of *Mimamsa*) did Gandhi encounter strong contemporary champions, but a good part of India's *Hindu* populace happens to be the adherent of one *Vedanta* sect or another (and a majority of scholars working in the field of Indian philosophy happen to be the sympathizers of *Advaita Vedanta*). Gandhi therefore thought it necessary to carefully analyze the respective philosophical standpoints of Sankar- the chief advocate of *Advaita Vedanta*- and Ramanuja- the chief advocate of *Visistadvaita Vedanta*-, devoting relatively much greater attention to the former. And by way of introducing his subject he quoted long passages from the famous *Chandogya Upanisad* dialogue between Uddalaka Aruni and his son Svetaketu. We are thus enabled to work out for ourselves of comparative estimate of the old-*Upanisadic* teaching, Sankara's teaching and Ramanuja's teaching on the fundamental questions of philosophy. In the course of his exposition of Sankara's philosophy Gandhi explicitly touches upon the problem of the relation in which this philosophy stands to the teaching contained in the old *Upanisads*. He rightly points out that Sankara's followers with their distinction between `lower' and `higher' truths find no difficulty in both accepting and repudiating the teaching of old *Upanishads* which seldom lend clear support to the idealist- illusionist philosophy of Sankara. As a matter of fact, in Gandhi's present lecture-series most of such remarks as can be construed as critical-remarks that are certainly few and far between- are concentrated in the part concerned with the exposition of Sankara's philosophy.

6. *BUDDHI*SM

The last non-Jaina system of philosophy considered by Gandhi is *Buddhi*sm. But here the exposition of the *Buddhi*st philosophy is preceded by a summary narration of Budda's life-story. The decision of include the biographical portion seems to have been a result of second thoughts but it has been well executed; for we are thereby assisted in forming a graphic idea of what it was in Buddha's life-activities that Gandhi admired most. In his exposition of the *Buddhi*st philosophy Gandhi confines himself to Southern *Buddhi*sm (i.e., the *Theravada* branch of *Hinayana Buddhi*sm). Now in the philosophical literature of Southern *Buddhi*sm much attention has been devoted to the ethico-religious problems and comparatively little to the metaphysical ones. The same is the case with Gandhi's account of the *Buddhi*st philosophy. For we are here given an account of the fourfold `noble truths', fthe seven `jewels' of the *Buddhi*st law, the *Buddhi*st notion of nirvana, the *Buddhi*st understanding of the `law of *Karma*', and such other ethico-religious topics, but the doctrine of `five *skandhas* (along with its corollary, the doctrine of `no soul') - the only metaphysical doctrine considered-is introduced as a sort of side-issue while dealing with the first `noble truth'. The only place where Gandhi pointedly raises objection against a *Buddhi*st position is revealing. For he feels that Buddha's acceptance of the `law of *Karma*' is incompatible with the latter's denial of `soul'. Now irrespective of whether this objection of Gandhi is valid or not it is definitely indicative of his repeatedly asserted conviction that an ethics in order to be sound must be based on a sound metaphysics.

7. JAINISM

Last of all Gandhi takes up the Jains system of philosophy, a system he himself espouses. As noted earlier, it is in this connection that Gandhi enumerates the four questions regarded by him as basic to all philosophical investigation. The questions are:

(1) What is the nature of the universe?
(2) What is the nature of God?
(3) What is the nature and what the destiny of soul?
(4) What are the laws of the soul's life?

Gandhi's account of the Jaina answer to these four questions is worthy of most serious consideration. For here we have a fine illustration of Gandhi's inexhaustible capacity to make the Jaina positions comprehensible to a non-Jaina audience-and a non-Jaina Western audience at that). Gandhi's `four questions' clearly prove that his understanding of what constitutes a philosophical investigation was truly all- comprehensive. Thus he would expect a philosophical system to touch upon the problems of metaphysics, psychology, ethics, as well as religion. Of course, Gandhi knew (and the present lecture-series is an evidence thereof) that not all-philosophical systems are equally interested in discussing these various generic types of problems, but he was convinced-perhaps, rightly that neglect of any of these types of problems on the part of a philosophical findings.

It is hoped that this preliminary introduction to Gandhi's lecture-series on the systems of

Indian Philosophy will help the reader in viewing it in a proper perspective.

The present edition of Gandhi's lecture-series is prepared on the basis of his own manuscript of it that is in the possession of Shri Mahavir Jain *Vidyalaya*, Bombay. However, this manuscript does not contain anything on Jainism. But the lecture (with the title `Jainism') published on pp. 41-60 of The Jaina Philosophy begins by mentioning that it is the last lecture of some lecture series; from this we have surmised that here is the lecture on Jainism that belongs to our lecture-series (which too need in the form of its last member a lecture on Jainism). Maybe our surmise is wrong but most probably it is not. Again, we learn from The Universalist Messenger, Chicago, February 10, 1984 (quoted at the end of the `Selected Speeches of Shri Virchand Raghavji Gandhi' published in May 1964 in the form of `Shri Vallabhsuri Jaina Literature Series, No. 10') : "The series of lectures on Oriental philosophy given by Mr. Virchand R. Gandhi every Monday evening at the residence of Mr. Chas. Howard, 6558 Stewart Boulevard, are growing more and more interesting. The subject philosophy." This (along with the fact that the first blank page of our manuscript carries the address `6558, Stewart Avenue, Englewood III)' is the basis of our surmising that our lecture-series was delivered at Chicago in 1984. Here again our surmise might possibly be wrong but most probably it is not.

Mistakes occurring in the manuscript that are obviously the slips of pen have been corrected by us without making mention of the fact, but the places where a mistake is just suspected or where the manuscript is not legible have been duly noted. The division of a lecture into sections and of a section into paragraphs (as also the titling of sections) has been undertaken by as with view to facilitating the reader's comprehension and Yoga Gandhi closely follows certain texts of the systems; hence at appropriate places a precise reference to the relevant passages from these texts has been made by us in the form of footnotes. In the case of *Buddhi*sm, similar reference has been made to a few passages from the *Abhidhammathasangaho*- a standard philosophical manual of *Theravada Buddhism*-; but this does not amount to claiming that it is this text that has been used by Gandhi. (The lectures on *Naya* and Vedanta are a few independent footnotes of our which seek either to elucidate of to complete or to criticize a remark made by Gandhi; (These are not footnotes given by Gandhi himself).

Following Gandhi's practice, no diacritical marks have been used in the Roman version of Indian proper names. However, since the technical terms of Indian philosophy, when written in Roman without diacritical marks, are likely to be misunderstood they have been given in *Devanagari*; (this too is in most cases a practice also of Gandhi-who however uses for the purpose the Gujarati script rather than Devanagri).

L. D. INSTITUTE OF INDOLOGY K. K. DIXIT
Ahmedabad-9.

I

THE *SANKHYA* PHILOSOPHY

1. We begin this evening with the *Sankhya* philosophy. Kapila, the reputed author of this philosophy was probably a Brahmin, Though nothing is known about him. He is the supposed author of two works- the original *Sankhya Sutras* called (*Sankhya Pravachan*) and a shorter work called (*Tatvsmas*). The *Sankhya* philosophy together *with Yoga, Naya, Vaisheshika, Mimamsa and Vedanta* nominally accepts *Veda* as its guide. It is the Philosophy of (*Sankhya*), i.e. enumeration or analysis of the Universe. Sir Monier Williams calls it by the name of synthetic enumeration. Sir William Jones calls it the Numeral Philosophy. It has been partly compared with the metaphysics of Pythagoras, partly in its *Yoga* with the system of Zeno. Others compare it with that of Berkeley.

2. It starts with the proposition that the world is full of miseries of three kinds- the three kinds of miseries:
(1) (*Adhyatmic*) due to one's self,
(2) (*Adhibhotic*) due to the products of elements and
(3) (*Adhidaevic*) due to supernatural causes-and that the complete cessation of pain of theses three kinds is the complete end and object of man. (*Trividhasya adhyatmic Adhibhotic, Adhidaevic, roopsay, dukhsay, atyantnivriti atyantPurushrth*.)[1]

This doctrine of *Sankhya* is similar to the tenets held by the Buddhists whose main doctrine is that the world is full of miseries. This is also the starting point of *Spinoza*. In his work `The Improvement of the Understanding' he says: "After experience had taught me that all the usual surroundings of social life are vain and facile seeing that none of the objects of my fears contain in themselves anything either good or bad, except in so far as the mind is affected by them, I finally resolved to inquire whether there might be some real good which the discovery and attainment would enable me to enjoy continuous, supreme and un-ending happiness." That is his starting point, just the starting point where the *Sankhya* starts. He goes on to say: " I thus perceived that I was in a state of peril and I compelled myself to seek with all my strength for a remedy, however uncertain it might be, as a sick man struggling with a deadly disease when he sees that death will surely be upon him unless a remedy be found, is compelled to seek such a remedy with all his strength, in as much as his whole hope lies therein. All the objects pursued by the multitude not only bring no remedy that tends to preserve our being, but even act as hindrance, causing the death not seldom of those who are possessed by them." He continues: "All these evils seem to have arisen from the fact that our happiness or unhappiness has been made the mere creature of the thing that we happen to be loving. When a thing is not loved, no envy if another bears it away, no fear, no hate; yes, in a world no tumult of soul. These things all come from loving that which perishes, such as the objects of which I have spoken. But

love towards a thing eternal feasts the mind with joy alone, nor hath sadness any part therein. Hence this is to be prized above all and to be sought for with all our might."

3. How was such a theory invented? In the West it has always been the case that the peculiar circumstances of the philosopher's life lead him into a peculiar belief, in the East the calm and quiet scenery and bountiful nature lead him to patiently inquire into the mysteries of the universe. Their contemporaries judge them from a false vantage ground. Spinoza in his owns age was denounced as a atheist, profane person, monster. Long afterwards however his works were re-discovered, greedily read, and admired by great poets like Goethe and by ardent and even romantic philosophers like Schelling. The *Sankhya* system too was considered by its commentators atheistic. But the present generation looks charitably upon it and tries to see some if not all-eternal truths in it.

4. I told you in the beginning that the *Sankhya* starts with the proposition that the world is full of miseries of three kinds. These are the results of the properties of matter (*Prakriti*) and not of its correlate intelligence of consciousness (*Purush*)[2]. Matter is eternal and co-existent with spirit. It was never in a state of non-being but always in a state of constant change, it is subtle and insentient. According to this view, *Prakriti* existed before the evolution of the universe and will continue so to exist for ever, but with time it has so much been changed that the unemancipated (*Atma*) (soul) is but ill able to comprehend its nature. It has lost its original state and has become earthy. In other words, *Prakriti* has assumed diverse shapes both gross and subtle[3].

5. Kapila's theory is strictly a theory of evolution. He says: (*Navstuno vstusidhi*) -- A thing is not made out of nothings.[4] *Avastunobhavat vastusidhirbhavotpatirnav sambhavti* It is not possible that out of nothing, i.e. an entity should arise. (*Yadyabhavat bhavotpatistarhi karan rupan karyai drishyat iti jagtopyavastusvanlllll*) -- If an entity were to arise out of a non-entity, then since the character of a cause is visible in its product the world also will be unreal[5]. When the *Vedantist* -the monist or the idealist-tell Kapila, `Let the world too be unreal, what harm is that to us?', he replies : *Abadhat adushtkaran·janyatvach navstuutvama*- The world is not unreal because these is no fact contradictory to its reality and because it is not the false result of depraved causes (leading to a belief in what ought not to be believed)[6]. (*Ahuktao rajatmiti gyanai naidan rajatmiti gyanat naidan rajatbadh na chatr naidan bbhavroopan jagditi ksyapi gyanan yain bhavroopbadh syat)* When there is the notion in regard to a shell of a pearl-oyster (which sometimes glitters like silver) that it is silver, its being silver is contradicted by the subsequent and more correct cognition that this is not silver. But in the case in question-that of the world regarded as a reality, no one ever has the cognition "this world is not in the shape of an entity", by which cognition if any one ever really had such its being an entity might be opposed[7]. (*Dushtkaran·janyatvach mithyaityavgamyatai yatha kamladidoshat peetshankhgyanan ksyachit, atr cha jagatgyanasya sarvaishan srvada stvann doshosti*)- And it is held that that is false which is the result of a depraved cause, e.g. someone's cognition of a white conch-shell as yellow, through such a fault as the

jaundice which depraves his eye-sight. But in the case in question-that of the world regarded as a reality, there is no such temporary or occasional depravation of the sense because all at all times cognize the world as a reality. Therefore the world is not an unreality[8].

Again he says: *Nasdutpado nrinshrigavt* - The production of that which does not already exist potentially is impossible like the horn of a man.[9] *Upadananiymat* - Because there must of necessity be a material out of which a product is developed.[10] Srvatr *srvada srvasanbhvat*- Because everything is not possible everywhere and always (which might be the case if materials could be dispensed with).[11] The meaning is this : *Srvatr srvasmin Daiichi srvada srvasmin kalai srvanutpatairlokdrshanat* - In the world we see that everything is not possible everywhere and at all times. And *Shaktasy shakyekaraṅat* - Because anything possible must be produced from something competent to produce it.[12]

In short, the Hindu philosopher's belief in the eternity of the world's substance arises from the fixed *article `Ex nihilo nihil fit,'* nothing is produced out of anything. All the ancient philosophers of Greece- who are believed to have borrowed their theories from India-seem to have agreed upon this point. Lucretius starts with laying down the same principal. He says: "It things proceed from nothing, everything might spring from everything and nothing would require a seed. Men might arise first from sea, and fish and birds from earth, and flocks and herds break into being from sky; every kind of beast might be produced at random in cultivated places or deserts. The same fruits would not grow on the same trees but would be changed. All things would be able to produce all things."

6. *Sankhya* philosophy then starts with an original primordial *tattva* or eternally existing essence called *Prakriti*- a word means that which evolves or produces everything else. Some philosophers translate this *Prakriti* by nature. Certainly, nature is anything but a good equivalent for *Prakriti*, which donates something very different from matter or even germ of mere material substances. It is an intensely subtle original essence, wholly distinct from soul yet capable of evolving out of itself consciousness and mind as well as the whole visible world.[13] In my opinion it is not even the name for anything which ever existed by itself. For Kapila himself in his work says: *Parnparyaipaikatr parinishthaiti sangyamatram*

In the manifestation of objects there must be a succession of causes without any end; and in Hindu logic the ruling idea is that you must suppose a point to exist where you should halt and *Prakriti* is only a halting point; therefore, it is in Kapila's words only a *sangyamatram*, i.e. merely a name given to the point in question, a mere sign to donate the cause which is the root which must be assumed rootless, merely to conform to the rule of Hindu logic.[14]

7. Let us now see how Kapila defines this *Prakriti*. It is *Satvrajstamasan* - *Prakriti* is the

state of equipoise of *Satv, Rajas, Tames* goodness or passivity, passion, energy or activity and darkness or grossness.[15] These three qualities passivity, activity and grossness- are not qualities in the ordinary sense. Qualities in the ordinary sense are attributes of *Prakriti*, they are rather the cords which when in a state of equipoise constitute *Prakriti*. On account of the disturbance of this state of equilibrium the whole world comes out. Kapila says: *Prakritairmhan mahatohankar ahankarat panchtanmatran i ubhyamindrayam tanmatraibhye sthoolbhootani Purush iti panchvinshtirgan* From *Prakriti* proceeds Mind *mehat*, from Mind self-consciousness, from self-consciousness the five subtle elements *Sthoolbhotani*[16] and two sets of organs *Indriyas* external and internal, and from subtle elements gross elements *sthoolbhootani* [16]. Thus *Prakriti* is the first basic primordial essence, and second principal evolved out of it is Mind, from Mind come out the third principal *Ahankara*, self-consciousness or individuality, from individuality come our five subtle elements and two sets of organs. These five subtle elements *are Shabd, Sparsh, Roop Ras Gandha*- sound, tangibility, form or color, taste and smell or odour[17]. The two sets of organs are external organs and internal organs. The external organs are again organs of sense and organs of action. The organs of sense are ear, skin, eye, nose, tongue; the organs of action are larynx, hand, foot, and the excretory and generative organs. These ten are external organs. The eleventh is the mind- the internal organ[18]. From the five subtle elements are produced five gross elements- *Akash* (ether), *Vayu* (air), *Taijas* (fire or light), *Apas* (water), *Prithvi* (earth)[19]. The twenty-fifth is the *Purush* - the *Soul*, which is neither producer nor produced but eternal like *Prakriti*. It is quite distinct from the producing or produced elements and creation of the phenomenal world, though liable to be brought into connection with them.

8. The arguments which Kapila brings forward for the existence of soul as a separate entity, distinct from *Prakriti*, are these; First, *Sanhatprarthatvat* that which combined and is therefore discreditable is finally for the sake of some other which is not discerptible[20]. The second argument *Trigun adivipryat Soul* is something else than *Prakriti* because there is in Soul the reverse of the three qualities passivity, activity and grossness[21]. The third argument is *Adhishthanach* -Soul is not material because of its superintendence over *Prakriti* (and a superintendent is an intelligent being while *Prakriti* is unintelligent)[22]. The fourth argument is *Bhoktribhavat* - Soul is not material because of its being the experiencer[23]. It is the *Prakriti* that is experienced, the experiencer is soul.

   What then is the nature of soul? Kapila answers: *Jadprkashayogat parkas* Since light does not pertain to the unintelligent, light is the essence of soul[24]. The followers of the Vaisheshika system think that intelligence is only an attribute of soul; really it is without quality[25]. It is essentially intelligent. If soul be unintelligent, it would not be a witness of its own comfort in profound and dreamless sleep[26]. He does not agree with the *Vedantists* when they say that soul is one only for it is eternal, omnipresent, changeless, void of blemish; on the contrary, he says that from the fact [that] when one person is born another dies and a third one becomes old at the same time [it follows that] there is a multiplicity of souls[27]. If soul were one only, when one is born all must be born[28]. Both the *Vedantists*

and the *Sankhya* are followers of the *Veda* and in the *Veda* there are passages like *Aikamaivadviteeyan brahm (chhandogyopanishad 6.2.1), naih nanasti kinchan (Vrihadan·ykopnishad 4.4.19) mritio sa mritiomapnoti ye eh nanaiv pashyati (kathopnishad* 2.1.10) - Brahma is one without a second; there is nothing here diverse; death after death does he, the deluded man obtain who here sees as if it were a multiplicity. Kapila gives an ingenious interpretation to these passages. He says that his view of the multiplicity of souls is not opposed to the above passages of the Upanisads because those texts refer to the genus of all souls, i.e. to the fact that all souls are of the same nature[29]. On the contrary he says in the *Puranas* we find passages to the effect that *Vamadeva* has been liberated, *Shuck* has been liberated. If soul were one, since the liberation of all would take place on the liberation of one the mention of diverse liberation's would be self-contradictory[30].

9. The soul is not considered by the *Sankhya* bound to matter. It is not bound, nor is it liberated. It is free. It has a delusive semblance of being bound. The nature of the soul is constant freedom and indifference to pleasure and pain alike[31].

10. These are the basic principals of the *Sankhya* philosophy. In short, according to its doctrines *Prakriti* and *Purush* are enough in themselves to and the idea of a creator is looked upon by the *Sankhya* as a mere redundant phantom of philosophy[32].

11. We may now enter into the details of this philosophy. In the first place let us ask Kapila what the motive is for the creation of the universe. He mentions two motives; they might have appeared satisfactory to him but to me his reply is not rational. He says that *Prakriti* created the universe for the emancipation of the soul which is really though not apparently emancipated or, secondly, for the removal of itself, i.e. for the sake of removing the actually real pain which consists of itself, as his commentator explains it[33]. It the soul is essentially free and essentially light, there was no necessity for *Prakriti* to interfere with the soul's infinite bliss.

That soul is really though not apparently emancipated means that it is really emancipated but appears to be not so. Gandhi's interpretation of the phrase seems to be somewhat far-fetched, but he is apparently following some commentator. The more natural interpretation of the phrase should be: "Or we may say that *Prakriti* created the universe for the sake of itself , that is, for the sake of the removal of pain that really belongs to itself."As we have noted, in the *Sankhya* philosopher's eyes pain is a phenomenon belongsing to *Prakriti* rather than to *Purush*.

12. Let us examine the other stages of creation. I told you in the beginning that from *Prakriti* sprang the Great Mind. What is this Great Mind? Kapila says: It is intellect and judgement or ascertainment is its peculiar modification; and *Dharma*, *gyan*, *Vairagya*, *Aeshvarya* i.e. merit, knowledge, dispassion and supernatural power arise out of it when there is in it a superlative degree of the first if the three qualities, i.e. *Satv*, purity or

passivity. But demerit, ignorance, non-dispassion and want of supernatural power arise out of it when there is in it a preponderance of the other two qualities[34]. From the great principal -the Greet Mind, we were told, is produced *Ahankara* i.e. self-consciousness. It is what makes the Ego. It is the same as *Antakaran* i.e. the internal instrument[35]. We were also told that the eleven organs and five subtle elements are produced from self-consciousness. But there is this distinction that the eleventh organ, the mind proceeds from self-consciousness in which the first quality *Satv*, purity or passivity- preponderates, while the other ten organs proceed from self-consciousness in which the second quality-activity or passion-predominates, and the five subtle elements proceed from self-consciousness in which the third quality-darkness or grossness- predominates[36]. I have already enumerated the eleven organs. The popular opinion is that the organs are formed of gross elements. But the *Sankhya* doctrine is that is not so because the *Veda* does not support that view and we know that Kapila could not assume an attitude of direct opposition to the *Veda*s[37]. There was another popular opinion about this mind-organ. It was that it is eternal, but Kapila says that none of the organs is eternal because the *Veda*s say so and because we see that they are destroyed.[38] Further he says that mind is the leading organ while the other ten are kinds of powers.[39] All these organs are mere instruments. As a king even without himself taking an active part becomes a warrior simply by employing an army, so does the soul, although quiescent, through the different organs, become a seer, a speaker, a judge and the like, merely by reason of its proximity with these organs[40].

There are some special properties belonging to the Great Intellect, self-consciousness and the mind. Attention or thought is the special property of the Intellect, conceit of personality is the property of self-consciousness, and decision and doubt of the mind[41], while the five airs- known as *Pran* etc. - are the common properties of all of them[42]. The modifications of the organs are *Prman· Vipreya, Vikalp, Nidra, Smriti,* evidence, chimera, sleep and memory. Some of them are painful, and others not painful[43]. When these modifications cease to exist the soul comes to a state of self-quiet[44]. The *Yoga* philosophy has the same doctrine. The very word *Yoga* means concentration and is defined as the suppression of the modifications of the thinking principal[45].

13. We will go still deeper into Kapila's philosophy. We have enumerated in the beginning the 25 principals commencing with *Prakriti* and ending with *Purusa*. *Prakriti* as *Prakriti* in a state of equilibrium is unable to produce anything. It is only when equilibrium is disturbed that the creation follows. *Purush*-the soul-itself is neither the producer nor the produced. Whence is the human body created according to this philosophy? Kapila says that out of the remaining twenty-three principals a pair of bodies *sthool shreer* and *Sooksham shreer* gross body and subtle body originates.[46] In fact the twenty-three principals act as the seed. out of which the body is produced and the fact that the soul becomes conditioned by the 23 principals is the cause of its going from one body to another in fact the cause of all mundane existence[47], and this mundane existence continues for each soul so long as it does not discriminate the difference between soul and *Prakriti*[48].

It should be noted how -ever that according to Kapila's theory the soul is not really fettered by matter, it only has a wrong impression that it is fettered. Really it is quite free. Only it does not realize this fact so long as it is in mundane existence. We come again to the pair of bodies- the gross body and the subtle body. The gross body usually though not always arises from father and mother, while the subtle body is a creation out of the principals[49]. Pleasure and pain belong to the subtle

Body, not to the gross body[50]. In the beginning of the creation there was but one subtle body which consisted of the collection of seventeen elements-eleven organs, five subtle elements and the *Buddhi*, i.e. the great intellect the understanding[51]. But through the diversity of actions later on the one subtle body became differentiated into many[52]. The subtle body does not exist independently, It has its tabernacle- the gross body for residing therein. As a shadow or a picture does not stand without a support, so the subtle body at death leaves one gross body and passes into another[53]. It cannot in fact exist independently because its essence is *Satvprakash* pure light and all luminous ether is seen only as associated with earthy substance.[54] The gross body is a composition of the five gross elements.[55]

14. What aims then are accomplished by the subtle body transmigrating from one gross body to another? Kapila says *Gyananmukti*. From knowledge (acquired through mundane existence) comes the liberation, i.e. the discrimination between soul and non-soul.[56] Bondage is also one of the aims of this transmigration but it arises on account of misconception[57]. Kapila altogether discards the theory of the efficacy of works as a means of salvation. To him only knowledge is the sole means of libertaion.[58] Even meditation is not the direct cause of liberation, though it is useful as secondary cause, for it removes desire, which really hinders knowledge[59]. So it is worth practicing, which can be done by stopping all modifications of the Mind[60]. This is done by *dharn[a] asan* and *Svkarm* restrain, posture and the fulfillment of duties.[61] By restrain I mean the restrain of breath by means of expulsion and retention under certain rules.[62] By posture is meant the peculiar position in sitting gives pleasure,[63] and by the fulfillment of the duties is meant by the performance of actions prescribed for one's religious order.[64] This meditation can be acquired only through *Vairagya* and *abhyasa* dispassion and constant practice.[65] Through meditation knowledge is acquired. But if misconception interferes, bondage will be the result. What is this misconception? It is fivefold *Avidya Asmat, Rag, Dvaish* and *Abhinivaish* ignorance, egoism, attachment, aversion and fear of dissolution.[66] Why should this misconception play its part at all? Simply because the powers called *Tushti* and *Siddhi* are impeded and hence arises the disability which cause misconception. Much can be said with reference to these powers of *Tushti* and *Siddhi*. But our time will not permit us to go into any details.[67] We shall come to some of them when we shall talk on the *Yoga* philosophy.

15. There is however one point to which, I should draw your attention. I mean the nature of the *Sankhya Mukti* the liberation of the soul. His theory is not, as misunderstood by Western orientalists, the theory of absorption. The soul on liberation does not merge into

the Universal Spirit or into the Absolute, for in his system there is no such thing as the Supreme Spirit or the Absolute. Not only does he not propound such a theory as the final object but on the contrary he refutes it.[68] He thinks that by merging into the primordial original essence, the *Prakriti*, the souls will have to rise again and pass through different mundane existence.[69] It is only when the right discrimination of soul and non-soul takes place that there will be the final emancipation of the soul.[70]

16. There is another point to which I should like to draw your attention. The *Sankhya* philosophy in a large measure supports the nature working under fixed laws without any interference on the part of an extra-cosmic being.

17. But of all his theories, one that has struck me to be the most liberal is the universal salvation theory. He does not restrict the liberation only to the few followers of his philosophy but to others also.[71]

18. So far we have tried to understand the meaning of Kapila's theory. Let us now see if it is consistent and appeals to our reason. In the first place, he says that *Prakriti* was in the beginning in a state of equilibrium. The three qualities, passivity, activity and grossness, were balanced. What then caused a disturbance in this state of equilibrium? Without external-causes, *Prakriti* cannot be disturbed. *Pursha* the soul is action-less, changeless, without any qualities or attributes.

Secondly, the Great Mind and self-consciousness are considered by Kapila to be different form each other. According to him one is the product of the other. And both of them are the outcome of *Prakriti*, which is really material. Now the Great Mind or *Buddhi* or intellect is nothing but a phase of consciousness. Self-consciousness-'I am happy ','I am unhappy'- is only a particular instance illustrating that phase and both of them imply knowledge and are but the characters of the soul but can never be the products of primordial material essence.

With regard to subtle elements Kapila says that gross elements are produced from these subtle elements; e.g., from odor comes out earth, from taste water, from color fire, from touch wind and from sound ether. If he means that the gross elements, which we see outside the human or any other gross organic body, are the products of these subtle elements, there is no reason to support it. The external elements we see are as eternal as anything else.

REFERENCES:

1. SS 1.1; SK 1

2. Since Purush (i.e. Soul) is here conceived in the from of pure consciousness (rather than a conscious substance) all properties whether physical or mental are somehow or other

traced to *Prakriti* (i.e. matter). But how mental properties-the threefold miseries, for example-can characterize matter is one of the obscurest point of the system.

3. Here is the *Sankhya* doctrine that it is only in the eyes of un unenlightened soul that *Prakriti* assumes the form of the world of day-to-day experience (while an enlightened soul views *Prakriti* in its pristine form).

4. SS 1.78
5. Ani. 1.78
6. SS 1.79
7. Ani. 11.79
8. Ibid
9. SS 1.114; SK 9
10. SS 1.115
11. SS 1.116
12. SS 1.117

13. Gandhi has himself earlier talked as it *Prakriti* is identical with mater, but now that he notes that *Prakriti* produces even consciousness he finds difficulty in accepting that position.

14. SS1.68. The *Sankhya* philosopher's idea seems to be that the physical world must have a root (or we must be faced with an infinite regress) but that it is immaterial whether this cause is given the name `*Prakriti*' or any other, However, in view of the basic obscurity of the *Sankhya* position on the question there is also sense in the way Gandhi interprets the present *Sankhya* aphorism.
15. SS 1.61
16. SS 1.61 SK 22
17. Ani. 1.61
18. Ibid
19. Ibid
20. SS 1.140; SK17
21. SS 1.141
22. SS 1.142
23. SS 1.143
24. SS 1.145
25. SS 1.146
26. SS 1.148
27. SS 1.149; SK 18; Gandhi's sentence needs some correction of the type here suggested.
28. Ani. 1.149
29. SS 1.154
30. SS 1.157
31. SS 1.162; SK 62

32. SS 1.92

33. SS 2.1; SK 56; That soul is really though not apparently emancipated means that it is really emancipated but appears to be not so. Gandhi's interpretation of the phrase *Svarth* seems to be somewhat far-fetched, but he is apparently following some commentator. The more natural interpretation of the phrase should be: "Or we may say that *Prakriti* created the universe for the sake of itself, that is, for the sake of the removal of pain that really belongs to itself." As we have noted, in the *Sankhya* philosopher's eyes pain is a phenomenon belonging to *Prakriti* rather than to *Purush*.

34. SS 2.13-15; Vijn.2.13-15; SK 23; Both *Aniruddha* and SK maintain that demerit etc. arise out of *Prakriti* when there is in it a preponderance of *Tames* (rather than of *Rajas* and *Tames*).

35. In *Sankhya* philosophy *Ant Karen* is the name usually given to the collection of *Manas*, *Ahamkar* and *Buddhi* alone-but seldom to *ahankara*. See *Aniruddha* on SS 2.38 (also SK 33) for the triple composition of *Anskaran* and SS 2.38 1.64 for the identification of *Antakaran* with *Buddhi*.

36. SS 2.17- 18; SK 24-25

37. SS 2.20

38. SS 2.22

39. SS 2.27; Vijn. 2.27

40. SS 2.29; Vijn. 2.39

41. SS 2.30; Vijn. 2.30

42. SS 2.31

43. SS 2.33; Ani. 2.33

44. SS 2.34

45. YS 1.2

46. SS 3.2; Vijn. 3.2

47. SS 3.3

48. SS 3.4

49. SS 3.7; SK39

50. SS 3.8

51. SS 3.9; In fact, A*hamkar* is the eighteenth constituent-element of the subtle body but as *Vijnanabhikshu* says it is here treated as included in *Buddhi*. *Aniruddha*, on the other hand, interprets the aphorism itself to mean that the subtle body is made up on eighteen elements.

52. SS 3.10

53. SS 3.12; SK 41

54. SS 3.13; Vijn. 3.13

55. SS 3.17

56. SS 3.23

57. SS 3.24

58. SS 3.25

59. SS 3.30
60. SS 3.31
61. SS 3.32
62. SS 3.33
63. SS 3.34
64. SS 3.35
65. SS 3.36
66. SS 3.37
67. SS 3.38-45; SK 45-51
68. SS 5.2-12;SK 57
69. SS 3.54
70. SS 3.63
71. It has not been possible to trace the original text that forms the basis of Gandhi's present contention

II

THE *YOGA* PHILOSOPHY

1. Much has been written and said on the mystic philosophy of ancient nations of the Egyptians, Greeks and Hindus. But I doubt whether it has been rightly understood. The advocates of modern science, some of them base the science of ethics on expediency, others on utility, while there are many to whom moral code is a commandment from a superior to an inferior. Thou shalt commit no murder. Why? The theologian would say-Because that is the commandment of God. The materialists will say- because that is the command of the ruling authority of the state. But why should God and the sovereign issue commands? There is no rational reply. A system of ethics not based on the rational demonstration of the universe is of no practical value. It is only a system of the ethics of individual opinions and individual convenience. It has no solidity and therefore no strength. The aim of human existence is happiness, progress; and all ethics teach how to attain one and achieve the other. The question however remains-What is happiness and what is progress? Those are issues not yet solved in any satisfactory manner in the West by the known systems of ethics. The reason is not far to seek. The modern tendency is to separate ethics from physics or rational demonstration of the universe and thus make it a science resting on nothing but the irregular whims and caprices of individuals and nations.

In India ethics has ever been associated with religion. Religion has ever been an attempt to solve the mystery of nature. Every religion has its philosophical as well as ethical aspect and the latter without the former has in India at least no meaning. If every religion has its physical and ethical side, it has its psychological side as well. There is no possibility of establishing a relation between physics and ethics but through psychology. Psychology enlarges the conclusions of physics and confirms the idea of morality.

The *Yoga* philosophy then is based on the idea that if man wants at all to understand his place in nature and to be happy and progressing he must aim at that physical, psychological and moral development which can enable him to pry into the depths of nature. He must observe, think and act, he must live, love and progress. His development must be simultaneous on all the three planes. The law of correspondence, according to this philosophy, rules supreme in nature and the physical corresponds as much to the mental as both in their turn correspond to the moral. Unless man arrives at this stage of corresponding and simultaneous development on the three planes he is not able to understand the meaning of his existence or existence in general, nor even to grasp the idea of happiness or progress. To that man of high aim whose body, mind and soul act in correspondence the higher, nay, even all, secrets of nature become revealed. He feels within himself as everywhere that Universal Life wherein there is no distinction, no sense of separateness, but therefore all bliss, unity and peace.

Lest I may be misunderstood as subscribing to the doctrine of *Yoga* philosophy except Jainism, I should tell you beforehand that what I am saying here is merely the doctrine of the *Yoga* Philosophy. In my theory in the highest spiritual plane, physical form is not a necessity for the realization of the highest truth. Form is only required in the infant state of development.

The peace of Universal Life then is according to the *Yoga* philosophy the peace of spiritual bliss *Moksh*. The course of nature never ceases, action always compels even the peaceful to act; but the individual being already lost in the All there is nothing unpleasant to disturb. The peace of spiritual development is indescribable and so are its powers indescribably vast. As you go on forgetting yourself, just in the same proportion do spiritual peace and spiritual powers flow towards you. When one consciously suppresses individuality by proper physical, mental moral and spiritual development he becomes part and parcel of the immutable course of nature and never suffers. This fourfold development and spiritual peace have been considered the end of philosophy. In India there have been six such schools of thought. Each starts with a more or less rational demonstration of the universe and ends with a sublime code of ethics. There are first the atomic *Vaisheshika* and the dialectic *Naya* schools seeking mental peace in devotion to the ruler of the universe. Then there are the materialist *Sankhya* and the practical *Yoga* schools teaching mental peace by proper analysis and practical training. Lastly there are the orthodox *Mimamsa* and the Unitarian *Advaita* schools, placing spiritual bliss in strict observance of *Vedic* injunction

and in realizing the unity of the Cosmos. It will thus be seen that *Yoga* is a complement of the *Sankhya*.

2. I told you last time when we met that the *Sankhya* philosophy starts with the proposition that the world is full of miseries of three kinds physical, supernatural and corporeal and that these are the results of the properties of matter and not of its correlate intelligence of consciousness, that out of the primordial essence *Prakriti* comes out the whole universe, by reason of the predominance of one or other of the three qualities of *Sativa*, *Rajas* and *Tams* passivity, activity, all grossness, darkness, ignorance of *Tams*, all pleasure, passivity, knowledge, peace of *Sativa*. The mind is a result of *Rajas* _ and it is *Sativa* alone which by its light illumines it and enables it at times to catch glimpses of the blissful *Purush* ever near to the *Sativa* [2]. As mind or the thinking principal plays an important part in the *Sankhya* and more so in the *Yoga* philosophy, for its chief article is 'Stop the transformation of the thinking principal and you will realize the Self', we will come to a consideration of the mind.

3. With the philosophers of the West, mind and soul are synonyms. The popular definition is- mind is the intellectual power in man. In the East there is a difference of opinion on this subject among the several philosophers. The followers of the *Naya* philosophy hold that all bodies having a form are impermanent but the mind being formless is permanent; it has special attributes and is likewise subtle; hence it is unable to grasp two objects at the same time. The *Sankhya* philosophy however of which *Yoga* is the complement considers the mind to be a derivative product. Till the *Purush*-soul-is emancipated from *Prakriti* the mind continues in a state of integrity. Its span of duration is limited to a *Mahapralaya* - the great Deluges when it disintegrates to be taken up by *Prakriti*. The seat of the mind has been the subject of an able discussion amongst the ancient philosophers. The followers of the *Purana*s and the *Tantrums* fix it in the forehead near the junction of the two eye- brows. The anatomical description would incline us to look upon the optic thalamus as the center of the mind. The *Vedanta's* hold the mind to be situated in the heart, for they say when an individual thinks of a subject he keeps it next to his heart as in the act of worshipping. There are some philosophers who identify the mind with the soul but Kapila refutes their views. He says: If mind and soul were one and the same, one would say 'I am the mind' instead of 'my mind, my hands'. According to him all experience consists of mental representation, the *Satva* being clouded, obscured or entirely covered over by the nature or property of representation. This is the root of evil. The act of the mind cognizing objects or, technically, taking the shape of objects presented to it is called *Verity* or transformation. It is the *Verity* which being colored by the presentation imparts the same color by representation to *Satva* and causes evil, misery, ignorance and the like. All objects are made of three *Gun*· or qualities and when the *Verity* or the transformation of the thinking principal sees everywhere nothing but the *Sativa* to the exclusion of the other two, presentation and representation become purely *Satvik* passive and the internal *Sativa* of the cognize realizes itself everywhere and in everything. In the clear mirror of the *Sativa* is reflected the bright and blissful image of the ever present

Purush who is beyond change, and supreme bliss follows. This state is called *Sativapati* or *Moksa* or *Kevalya*[4]. For every *Purush* who has thus realized itself *Prakriti* has ceased to exist, in other words, has ceased to cause disturbance and misery. The course of nature never ceases but one who receives knowledge remains happy throughout by understanding the truth. The *Sankhya* tries to arrive at this result by a strict mode of life accompanied with analysis and contemplation.

This state of peace besides being conducive to eternal calm and happiness is most favorable to the apprehension of the truths of nature. That intuitive knowledge, which is called *Tarka*, puts the students in possession of almost every kind of knowledge he applies himself to. It is indeed this fact on which the so-called powers of *Yoga* are based.

4. The *Yoga* philosophy subscribes to this *Sankhya* theory in toto. It however appears to hold that *Purush*- Soul-by himself cannot easily acquire that *Satvik* development which leads to knowledge and bliss. A particular kind of *Eashwar* or Supreme God is therefore added for the purposes of contemplation etc. to the twenty-five categories of the *Sankhya*. This circumstance has obtained for *Yoga* the name of *Saishvar Sankhya* or theistic *Sankhya* as the *Sankhya* proper is called *nireashwar Sankhya* or atheistic *Sankhya*.

5. The second and really important improvement on the *Sankhya* consists in the highly practical character of the rules laid down for acquiring eternal bliss and knowledge. The end proposed by the *Yoga* philosophy is *Samadhi* leading to *kaivalya*. *Yoga* and *Samadhi* are convertible terms, either meaning Vritinirodh or suspension of the transformations of the thinking principal.[5]

6. With this introduction we will enter into the details of this philosophy. We have defined *Yoga* to be the suppression of the transformation of the thinking principal. What is the thinking principal and what are its transformations and what results are achieved by the practice of *Yoga*? As to its power it teaches that the powers of electricity and magnetism are but a drop in the ocean compared with those of the soul, when they are fully developed by the practice of *Yoga*. But this is no part of true *Yoga*, although the lower form of *Yoga* does teach, how to develop these powers.[6] The scope of true *Yoga* lies in the realization of the immortal part of man and the keynote of this self-realization lies in the suppression of the transformation of the thinking principal.

The thinking principal is a comprehensive expression equal to the *Sanskrit* word *Antakaran*, which is divided into four parts-(I *Manas* or mind, the principal which cognizes generally; (ii) *Chit* or individualizing, the idea which fixes itself upon a point and makes the object its own by making it an individual; (iii) *Ahamkar* or egoism, the persuasion which connects the individual with the self; and (iv) *Buddhi* or reasons, the light that determines one way or another.[7] Knowledge or perception is a kind of transformation *Parinam* of the thinking principal into anything which is the subject of external or internal presentation, through one or other of these four. All knowledge is of

the kind of the transformation of the thinking principal. Even the will, which is the very first essential of *Yoga*, is a kind of such transformation. *Yoga* is a complete suppression of the tendency of the thinking principal to transform itself into objects, thoughts etc. It is possible that there should be degrees among these transformations and the higher ones may assist to check the lower ones, but *Yoga* is acquired only when there is complete cessation of the one or the other. It should distinctly be borne in mind that the thinking principal in this philosophy is not the soul who is the source of all consciousness and knowledge. The suppression of the transformations of the thinking principal does not therefore mean that the yogi- the practitioner of the *Yoga*-is enjoined to become all, which is certainly impossible. The thinking principal has three-property passivity, activity and grossness. When the action of the last two is checked the mind stands steady like the jet of a lamp in a place protected from the least breeze. When all the transformation of the thinking principal are suppressed there remains only the never changing eternal soul-the *Purush*-in the perfect *Sata* passivity. Otherwise when the thinking principal transforms itself into objective and subjective phenomena the *Purush* is for the time obscured by it or which is the same thing assimilated into it. It is only when the state of *Yoga* is reached that the consciousness becomes quite pure and ready to receive all knowledge and all impressions from any source whatever. If this state is to be acquired by suppressing the transformations of the thinking principal, let us see what these transformations are.

7. In *Yoga* philosophy the thinking principal is modified in five ways. First when there comes to it the right knowledge, second when there comes to it false knowledge, third when it is simply put into complex imagination or fancy, fourth when we are sleeping and fifth when we are exercising the faculty of memory.[10] Let us examine each condition. The theory as to how the external world is cognized is a complicated one, but in order to explain it in the simplest way it will do to say [the following]. When organs of sense are put in contact with external objects they are put in to a state of vibration and cause a similar vibration on he mind-substance. This charge in the mind-substance is called direct cognition. It is only one kind of right knowledge. The mind is also transformed when it infers or draws conclusions and also when it receives knowledge from words of authority-trust worthy authority. These three kinds of knowledge are collectively known as right knowledge. When the mind cognizes in any of the three ways there is a corresponding motion or change produced in it. That is one way in which mind becomes subject to transformation. The second way in which it is modified is false knowledge. This is when a false conception is entertained of a thing whose real form does not correspond to that conception, for instance, when a mother of pearl is mistaken for silver or a post mistaken for a man. The third way in which the mind is modified is by having fancied notions, i.e. notions called into being by mere words having nothing to answer to them in reality. The fourth way in which the mind is transformed is sleep and the fifth way is the exercise of memory, i.e. by recollection impressions of past experience. It may be remarked that of these five kinds of transformations of the mind, right knowledge, false knowledge and fancy belong to the waking state. When any of these becomes perceptible in sleep it is dream. Sleep itself has no cognition. Memory may be (may depend on?) any

of them.

8. Now the suppression of these transformations is the *Yoga,* which leads to the realization of the Self. What are the means of suppressing them? The author of the *Yoga Sutras* says that complete suppression of the transformation of the mind is secured only by sustained application and non-attachment.[11] Application is of course steady sustained effort to reach that state and non-attachment is the consciousness of having mastered every desire for any object. And further rules are given for the purpose of rising to that high state of self-knowledge.

9. But in the meantime I will draw your attention to the fact that some scholars like Monier Williams and others have thought that this system of *Yoga* is nothing but a mere contrivance of getting rid of all thought and that it is a strange compound of mental and bodily exercises, consisting in unnatural restraint, forced and painful postures, twisting and contortions of the limbs, suppression of the breath and utter absence of mind. In the opinion of such scholars it is not possible that a man should actually know any thing transcending his sensual perception unless it is told to him by some supposed authority. In their opinion the power of intuition cannot be developed to such an extent as to become actual knowledge without any possibility of error and we shall always be doomed to depend upon hearsay and opinions. To them extra-ordinary powers of the soul are mere dreams. The author of the 'Modern Science and Modern Thought' says: "Almost the entire world of the supernatural fades away of itself with an extension of our knowledge of the laws of nature, as surely as the mists melt from the valley before the rays of the morning sun. We have seen how throughout the wide domains of space, time and matter, law uniform, universal and inexorable reigns supreme, and there is absolutely no room for the interference of any outside personal agency to suspend its agency (Hindus have never said so). The last remnant of supernaturalism therefore, apart from Christian Miracles which we shall presently consider, has sunk into that doubtful and shady borderland of ghosts, spiritualism and mesmerism, where vision and fact and partly real partly imaginary effects of abnormal nervous conditions are mixed up in a nebulous haze with a large dose of imposture and credulity." These are the words of a famous English writer. Let us hear then what the neighbor of the John Bull says in regard to the claim of the modern scientist. Dr. Heinrich Hensoldt of Germany says: "Apart from the material progress or mere outward development which the Hindoos had already attained in times which we are apt to call pre-historic as evinced by the splendor of their buildings and the luxuries and refinements of their civilization in general, it would seem as if this greatest and most subtle of Aryan races had developed an inner life even more strange and wonderful. Let those who are imbued with the prevalent modern conceit that we Westerners have reached the highest pinnacle of intellectual culture, go to India. Let them go to the land of mystery, which was ancient, when the Great Alexander crossed the Indus with his warriors, ancient, when Abraham roamed the plains of Chaldea with his cattle, ancient when the first pyramid was built, and if after a careful study of Hindoo life, religion and philosophy, the inquirer is still of opinion that the palm of intellectual advancement belongs to the Western world-let him

lose no time in having his own cranium examined by a competent physician." These are the words of Dr. Hensoldt.

10. Without caring much what the foreigners have to say in reference to the religions and philosophies of India we will come to our own subject. We have said before that *Yoga* is the suppression of the manifestations of the mind. The source of the positive power therefore lies in the soul. In the very wording of the definition of *Yoga* is involved the supposition of the existence of a power which can control and suppress the manifestations of the mind. This power is the power of the soul-otherwise familiar to us as freedom of the will. So long as the soul is subject to the mind it is tossed this way or that in obedience to the mental changes. Instead of the soul being tossed by the mental changes, the mind should vibrate in obedience to the soul-vibrations. When once the soul becomes the master of the mind, it can produce any manifestations it likes. The ancient Chaldeons and the modern monks of India, Japan and China teach the same doctrine. It was by the aid of this *Yoga* science that the ancients made many discoveries in chemistry and medicine.

11. We will now come to our point. The suppression of all mental modification produces the state called *Yoga* or *Samadhi*. This *Samadhi* is of two kinds *Svikalp* and *nirvikalpa*. The first is that in which the mind is at rest only for the time, the other is that in which through supreme universal non-attachment it is centered in (passivity) *Satva* and realizes *Satva* everywhere for all time. The mind being as it were annihilated *Purush*-the soul-alone shines in native bliss.[12] This is called *Kaivalya*. This is the end view. This is the summum onum, the end and aim of philosophy. Between this end and the first stage of mental suppression there are several stage. The author of the *Yoga* aphorisms mentions eight stage; they are *Yam, Niyam, Aasan, Pran·am, Pratyahar, Dharn·a, Dhyan, Smaddhi* This leads us to the practical part of *Yoga*.

12. (a)The first stage is *Yam*. What a student of *Yoga* is required to do in the first stage is forbearance or control over mind, body and speech and it consists in abstaining from killing, falsehood, theft, incontinence and greediness.[14] (i) The first of these is killing-*Hinsa* in *Sanskrit*. It is difficult to give the full meaning of this word *Hinsa*. It means wishing evil to any being by word, act or thought and abstinence of this kind of killing is the first requirement of a student of *Yoga*. It obviously implies abstinence from animal food in as much as it is never procurable without direct or indirect *Hinsa* of some kind. Not with standing the sanction given by the *Veda*s to the system of sacrificing animals to gods, the Hindu scriptures are very strong on this point when they treat of the practical part of the *Yoga* philosophy. Manu, the great law- maker of the Hindus, says:

Anuyanta vishsita nihanta kryavikryee
Sanskatee chopharta cha khadkshchaitee ghatak

[One who indirectly gives permission to kill animals, one who separates the several parts of an animal after it is killed, one who actually kills the animal, one who sells meat, one

who cooks meat, one who serves meat at the table and one who eats it are all considered killers of the animal.]

Akritva pran·inan hinsan mansan notpadyatai kachit
Na cha pran·ivdhat svarg tsmanmansan vivrjyait

[You cannot get meat unless an animal is killed, killing of animals can never lead to a higher state, therefore abstain from meat altogether.] The avoidance from animal food from another point of view is strongly recommended, as it always leads to the complete obscuration and even annihilation of intuition and spirituality. It is to secure this condition of being ever with nature and never against it or, in other words, being in love with nature that all other restrictions are prescribed. (ii) The next requirement is abstaining from falsehood, i.e. from telling what we do not know or believe to be the exact state of things. (iii) The third thing to be avoided includes, besides actual illegal appropriation, even the thought for any such gain. (iv) So also does incontinence, the fourth danger in the path of success, include, besides physical enjoyment, even talking to, looking at or thinking of the other sex, with lustful intention. And here we come to the very important point of view of celibacy. We know that even doctors of eminence talk about the dictates of nature-as if animosity and brutality are natural parts of man. They may talk about sexual needs, imperious necessities, and uncontrollable passion. But when we come to the actual state of facts, we will realize the truth. We know that the trainer of a pugilist denies his man all sexual indulgence whatever, the trainer on a boat's crew would abandon all hope of victory if he knew that his men visited women even once a week. Indeed so jealous is he that he will not permit his wards even to talk much with the other sex, lest some erotic fancy should affect the condition of their nerves. An eminent doctor of the United States says: "All eminent physiologists who have written on this point agree that the most precious atoms of the blood enter into the composition of the semen. A healthy man may occasionally discharge his seed with impunity, but if he chooses- with reference as in the pedestrian, boat-racer, prize-fighter or explorer or with reference to great intellectual and moral work as in the apostle Paul, Sir Isaac Newton and a thousand other instances- to refrain from sexual pleasure, nature well knows what to do with those precious atoms. She finds use for them in building up a keener brain and more vital and enduring nerves and muscles." The chief monk of my community Muni Atmaramji was once asked by a Hindu gentleman, how it was that in running contrary to the course of nature- i.e. not obeying the urgent demands of natural instincts in such nature- he could build up his constitution which could well defy the attacks of an athlete or a stalwart. The monk in reply simply recited a verse:

Sinho balee dvirdashookrmansjeevee
Sanvtsrain· Ratimaiti kilaekvaram
Paravat kharshilakan·matrjeevee
Kamee bhavtynudinan vad kotr haitu

[The lion eats the flesh of elephants and hogs and is the strongest of all animals, still he enjoys sexual intercourse only once in a year, while doves and pigeons that live on dirt and sorts of refuse are lustful every day.] (v) The last of the five forbearances is greediness. It consists not only in coveting more that necessary but also in keeping in possession anything beyond the very necessaries of life. Some practitioners are known to carry this requirement to the extent of even not accepting anything whatever from others. We thus finish the list of five kinds of forbearances; that is the first stage through which a student of *Yoga* has to pass.

(b) The second stage is *Niyam*, i.e. observances. They are also five, purity, contentment, austerity, study and resignation to *Eashwar*, - the Lord[15]. The five kinds of forbearances, which we mentioned before, were negative injunctions, the five kinds of observances, which we are now describing, are positive commands. (i) The first in purity, i.e. purity bodily and mental which latter consists in universal love and equanimity. (ii) The second is contentment- being satisfied with one's lot. (iii) The third is austerities, i.e. fasts, penances, observances etc. mentioned in the Hindu Dharma Shastras. (iv) Study-the fourth- is the repetition of the sacred mystic word OM or any other holy incantation. (v) Resignation to *Eashwar* the fifth observance- means that the practitioner should so abandon himself to the will of the Supreme that he must move about only to fulfil his benign wish, not to accomplish this or that result. He must bear all good, bad or indifferent, simple as an act of his grace in carrying which he only pleases him. The five kinds of forbearances and the five kinds of observances make ten.

13. (a) (i) The first forbearance was abstinence from killing. What is its result? When one has acquired that confirmed frame of mind- the positive feeling of universal love for all living creatures, even natural antipathy is held in abeyance in his presence;[16] needless to add that no one harms or injures him. All beings, men, animals, birds approach him without reserve. In an extended description of the religious rites, monastic life and superstitions of the Siamese dela loubete cites among other things the wonderful power over wild beasts possessed by the Talapoin (the monks or the holy men of Buddha whose first injunction was protection of all living beings). "The Talapoin of Siam", he says, "will pass whole weeks in the dense woods under a small awning of branches and palm leaves and never make a fire in the night to scare away the wild beasts, as all other people do who travel through the woods of this country. The people consider it a miracle that no Talapoin is ever devoured. The tigers, elephants and rhinoceroses- with which the neighborhood abounds- respect him and travelers placed in secure ambuscade have often seen these wild beasts lick the hands and feet of the sleeping Talapoin." The Jaina history also testifies to the same fact. Mahavira- The twenty-fourth prophet of the Jainas who lived 600 years before Christ- is reported to have attracted, by the sweetness of his musical sermons in parks, wild beasts and animals who stood before him in perfect peace and harmony. Even in the present times no wild beast is known to have devoured a Jaina in India whose first principal is the protection of life -even of the tiniest insect. Strange to say that the Western powers and nations attempt to restore peace and harmony among people by the sharpest

swords, huge man-killing machines and animal-food.

(ii) The second forbearance of the five we mentioned before is truthfulness. What is the result? When entire and unswerving truthfulness is fully established, all thoughts and words become immediately effective.[17] What others get by act such as sacrifice to deities etc. He gets by mere thought or word. Emperor Marcus Aurelius says: "He who acts unjustly acts impiously, for since the universal nature has made rational animals for the sake of one another, to help one another according to their deserts, but in no way to injure one another, he who transgresses his will is clearly guilty of impiety towards the highest divinity. And he too that lies is guilty of impiety to the same divinity, from the universal nature of all things that are; and all things that are have a relation to all things that come into existence. And future this universal nature is named Truth and is the prime cause of all things that are true. He then who lies intentionally is guilty of impiety in as much as he acts impiously by deceiving and he also who lies unintentionally in as much as he is at variance with the universal nature, and in as much as he disturbs the order by fighting against the nature of the world; for he fights against it, who is moved of himself to that which is contrary to truth, for he has revived powers from nature, through the neglect of which he is not able now to distinguish falsehood from truth. And indeed he who pursues pleasure as good and avoids pain as evil is guilty of impiety."

What is true of individuals is true of nations. We know that Spain, Greece and Turkey are dishonored in the commercial world. His riches killed Spain. The gold which came pouring into Spain from her vanquished colonies in South America depraved the people, and rendered them indolent and lazy. Now a day, Spaniards would blush to work. He will not blush to beg. The same has been the case with Greece also. She has repudiated her debts for many years. Like Turkey she has nothing to pay. All the works of industry in those countries, are done by foreigners.

Much better things might have been hoped from Pennsylvania and other American states, which repudiated their debts many years ago. They were rich states and the money borrowed from abroad made them richer, by opening roads and constructing canals for the benefit and privation" it was he who was the congress at Washington which he afterwards published "The Americans", he said, "who boast to have improved the institutions of the old world have at least equaled its crimes. A great nation after trampling under foot all earthly tyranny has been guilty of a fraud as enormous as ever disgraced the worst king of the most degraded nation of Europe."

But the state of Illinois acted nobly though it was poor. It had borrowed money like Pennsylvania, for the purpose of carrying out internal improvements. When the inhabitants of rich Pennsylvania set the example of repudiating their footsteps. As every householder had a vote it was easy, if they were dishonest, to repudiate their debts.

A Convention met at Springfield and the repudiation ordinance was offered to the meeting.

It was about to be adopted, when an honest man stopped it. Stephen A. Douglas was being sick at his hotel, when he desired to be taken to the Convention. He was carried on a mattress, for he was too ill to walk. Lying on his back he wrote the following resolution, which he offered as a substitute for the repudiation ordinance:

"Resolved that Illinois will be honest although she never pays a cent."

The resolution touched the honest sentiment of every member of the Convention. It was adopted with enthusiasm. It dealt a deathblow to the system of repudiation. The canal bonds immediately rose, capital and emigration flowed into the state and Illinois is now one of the most prosperous states. She has more miles of railway than any of other states. Her broad prairies are one great grain field and are dotted about with hundreds of thousands of peaceful happy homes. This is what truthfulness does. It this is true in the science of nations how much more is it true in the highest known science- the *Yoga*?

(iii) [The last time we left our subject with the result, which can be, worked out from the second kind of forbearance the truthfulness. We will proceed with the rest of them.] The third kind of forbearance is abstinence from self-love and desire of misappropriation. To him who has given up this, all jewels and wealth stumble at his feet even without seeking them.[18]

(iv) The fourth kind of forbearance is continence. On this subject we dwelt at some length the last time. The point settled in this *Yoga* philosophy is that it is a physiological law that the creative essence in man is closely connected with the intellect and spirituality. Waste of this spiritual element means waste of bodily and mental powers. Preservation of this elements means the acquisition of (?) powers of the brain and body.[19] No *Yoga* is ever reported successful without the observance of this rule as an essential preliminary.

(v) The fifth kind of forbearance is abstinence from greediness. The *Yoga* philosophy teaches that when desire is destroyed, when in fact even the last and subtle but unconquerable desire for life too is given up, there arises knowledge of the why and wherefore of existence.[20]

(b) We mentioned last time five forms of observances. They are purity, bodily and mental, contentment, austerities, study and resignation to *Eashwar*. (i) It is needless to say that mental purity leads to passivity, pleasantness, fix attention, subjugation of the senses and fitness for communion with soul.[21] (ii) The second observance is contentment. Superlative happiness is the result of contentment.[22] (iii) As for the austerities, the *Yoga* philosophy claims that miraculous powers of the body and the senses arise therefrom;[23] the inner sense becomes more developed in proportion to the mortification of the flesh and various methods more or less severe are practiced in all religions. Miraculous powers known as second sight, levitation etc. are the result of austerities. Even some ignorant classes of India are known to possess these powers. They are accounted to flow on account of

austerities practiced in past incarnation though in ignorance of the laws of such powers. Although these are the sign of the real *Yoga* power, they are not the true end of *Yoga*. (iv) Study-the fourth observance-is claimed to lead to communion with the higher and subtler forces of nature.[24] The constant silent and devoted repetition of certain formulas is said to be efficacious in establishing a sort of communion with the higher powers of nature. (v) And the resignation to *Eashwar* leads to the accomplishment of that final state of quietude, the *Samadhi* [25] We have then finished the first two stages through which a practitioner to *Yoga* has to pass.

14. The third stage is posture. Various modes of keeping the body in position at the time of perfuming *Yoga* are given in different books. The general and most convenient definition of posture is that it should be perfectly steady and should cause no painful sensation.[26] There is a class of yogis in India who hold that the breath in the body is a part of the universal breath and that the health of mind and body accompanied by spiritual bliss and knowledge will follow on controlling the individual breath in such a manner as to attune it to the cosmic breath. Their methods are more physical than mental. They give much attention to the different postures of the body to be assumed while practicing the *Yoga*. These postures are said to be 84 in number and each has its peculiar influence in the body and the mind. By various kinds of postures and modes of controlling the breath the yogis get over almost all kinds of diseases. Of these postures four are considered the best for *Yoga* practice. The first is *Swastic* posture. In that posture you have to sit with the body perfectly straight placing the right foot in the cavity between the left thigh and calf and the left foot in the cavity between right thigh and the calf. The second is the *Sidh* posture, the third is the *Padm* posture and the fourth is the *Bhadra* posture. As none of us is ready and willing to pass through all the difficult stages of the *Yoga* it is needless to describe these postures. Suffice it to say that the *Hathyogi* having mastered one of the postures commences the actual practice of *Yoga*. *Hatha Yoga* Pradipika- the text book of these yogis says: "One who abstains totally form sexual intercourse, keeps temperate habits and remain free from worldliness becomes a yogi after a full twelve month's practice. By temperance in eating is meant the eating only three fourths of what is actually required. The food also should consist of substantial liquids and solid. Bitter, acid, pungent, salty and hot things as well as green vegetables, oil, intoxicating drugs, animal food of every description, curds (?) etc. are to be strictly avoided. Wheat, rice, barley, milk, butter, sugar, honey, dry ginger, oats and natural water are most agreeable. In the beginning avoid fire, sexual intercourse and extreme exertion. Young, old, decrepit or sick may all obtain success by study practice; none succeeds who lacks in practice; mere reading of *Yoga* books or talking on the subject can never conduce to success."[27]

15. The fourth stage through which a student has to pass is Pran·*ayam* the control of the expiration and inspiration of the breath. It does not mean that there ought to be an unnatural flow or control of the breath; it means rather that the breath should be controlled or allowed to flow in accordance with the result to be attained. There are three kinds of *Pran·ayam*. When the breath is expired or held out it is called *Raichak* the first *Pran·ayam*.

When it is drawn in it is called *Poorak* the second *Pran·ayam*. When it is suspended all at once it is called *kumbhaka* the third *Pran·ayam*.[28] These three are again regulated by time. Works on *Yoga* say that three kind of *Pran·ayam* are often to be combined in one single act and their number should be slowly and slowly carried to eighty every time one sits for practice. There are other works, which say that the number must be sufficient to enable the student to mark the first Udghat and follow it afterwards. By *Udghat* they mean the rising of the breath form the navel and its striking at the roof of the palate. *Pran·ayam* has its chief object the mixing of *Pran·* the upper breath and *Apan* the lower breath and rising them upwards by degrees and stages till they subside in called *Kudlini*. It is this force which is the source of all occult powers. The general practice is to begin with *Raichak* followed by *Poorak* by the same nostril, whence the control is begun over again with *Poorak* and onward. This is called one *Pran·ayam*. The *Hatha Yoga Pradipika* says on this subject as follows:

"Having mastered some one posture and observing the rules of etc. the yogi may begin the study of regulating the breath. Disturbance of mind follows disturbance of breath and mind remains calm when the breath is calm; hence in order to attain fixing of mind the breath should be controlled. So long as the *Nadee* the vehicles of *Pran·* Are obstructed by abnormal humors, there is no possibility of the *Pran·* Running the middle course *Sushuman·*a and of accomplishing the *Unman·i mudra*.[29] Hence *Pran·ayam* should be practiced in the first instance for the clearance of these humors. The *Pran·ayam* for this purpose is as follow: Having assumed the *Parmesan* posture the yogi should inhale at the left nostril and, having retained the breath for the time he easily can, should let it off at the opposite nostril, and repeat the same process beginning with the nostril where he exhales. This will make one *Pran·ayam*. These should be practiced four times in twenty-four hours, in the morning, at noon, in the evening, at midnight, and should be carried to eighty each time. The process in its lowest stage will produce perspiration, in its middle stage tremor, and its highest stage levitation. The student may rub off his body with the perspiration, for this will make his body strong and light. In the beginning of the practice being mastered no such rule is necessary. The breath should be mastered slowly and by degrees, just as are trained tigers, bears and other wild beasts, for otherwise the rash student is sure to come to grief. Proper *Pran·ayam* destroys all diseases, improper one produces them. When the humors of the *Nar·*ee are cleared the body becomes light and beautiful and digestion becomes strong, health ensues, the retention of breath is done without effort and the *Nad* (sound) within becomes audible."

The opinion of the *Yoga* author is that by this practice of *Parmesan* the outer covering of the soul-the result of *karma*- is removed and the real nature of the soul is realized once and for ever.

16. This leads us to the fifth stage through which the practitioner has to pass. By the practice of *Pran·ayam* the mind becomes fit for being quite absorbed in the subject thought of. It is *Parmesan* the mind becomes fit for being quite absorbed in the subject thought of.

It is *Praṇayam*, which leads the way to this state, which is the fifth stage. It is *Praṇayam* (abstraction)-imitating by the senses, the thinking principal by withdrawing themselves from their objects. It consists in the sense becoming entirely assimilated to or controlled by the mind. They must be drawn away from their objects and fixed upon the mind and assimilated to it, so that by preventing the transformation of the thinking principal, the senses also will follow it and will be immediately controlled. Not only that, but they will be ever ready to contribute collectively towards the absorbing meditation of any given thing at any moment and even always.

17. Passing through these five stages, *Yam, Niyam, Aasan, Parmesan* and *Pratyahar* the *yogi* purifies the inner self by avoiding distraction. We then come to the sixth stage *Dharaṇa* or contemplation. It is the fixing of the mind on something, external or internal. If internal it may be the tip of the tongue or the nose or any convenient spot. If external it may be any suitable image of the deity, or a picture or any similar object. Of course it is necessary to bear in mind that any such thing contemplated upon externally or internally should be strictly associated with nothing but holiness and purity. The mind should be able to picture in itself the object even in its absence in all vividness and at an instant's notice.

18. The next stage is *Dhyan* or absorption, i.e. the entire fixing of the mind on the object thought of to the extent of making it one with it. In fact the mind should at the time be conscious of itself and the object.

19. Proceed a step further and we come to the eighth stage, the *Samadhi*. The absorption is to be carried to the extent of forgetting the act and of becoming the thing thought of. This state of *Samadhi* implies two distinct states of consciousness unified in one. The first- that is trance proper- is the forgetting of all idea of the act and the second- the more important factor- is the becoming the object thought of. Mere passive trance is a dangerous practice as it leads to the madness of irresponsible medium-ship. It is therefore necessary to lay stress upon the second part of the connotation of the term *Samadhi*.

20. The three stages, contemplation, absorption and trance are in fact stages of contemplation; for the thing thought upon, the thinker and the instrument together with other things, which are attempted to be excluded are all present in the first, i.e. contemplation, all except the last, i.e. two, are present in the second and nothing but the thing is present in the third. This trance *Samadhi* however is not complete *Yoga,* for it is only *Svikalpak* or conscious *Samadhi*, having something to rest upon.

Sanyam is the technical name for these three inseparable processes taken collectively. When the three are successively practiced with respect to the one and the same object at any one time it is called *Sanyam*. But it is practiced by stages. One cannot pass all at once to the highest kind of *Sanyam* any more than one can think of something without first knowing it. For example, when *Sanyam* is practiced with respect to a mental image, the process will tend from contemplating upon the gross to [that upon] the subtle. The image

may be thought of in all parts, then without the decoration, then without limbs, then without any special identity and lastly as not apart from self.

21. We have thus finished the eight stages. The first five of them are only the preliminaries to the *Yoga*, which really consists in the last three. The first five accessories are called the external means of *Yoga*. The last three are internal.[37] Even the *Sanyam* as the last three are so called collectively) is merely preparatory for the final end, the unconscious *Samadhi* for in *Sanyam* there is something to depend upon whereas in real *Samadhi* there is nothing to depend upon.

The question therefore naturally arises- what does the mind transform itself into in that state of unconscious *Samadhi*? The transformed state in that *Samadhi* is known in *Sanskrit* as *nirodha*, i.e. interception of all transformations, thoughts or distractions- of course not ordinary distractions but the distraction, which is still there in the form of conscious *Samadhi*, conscious *Samadhi*, is a distraction, no doubt, for there is yet something which the mind entirely transforms itself into. The moment the mind begins to pass from one state into the other, two distinct processes begin viz. the slow but sure going out of the impressions that distract and the equally gradual but certain rise of the impressions that intercept. When the intercepting impressions gain complete supremacy, the moment of interception is achieved and the mind transforms itself into this intercepting moment so to speak. It is in the interval of this change that the mind may drop and fall into what is called *Ley* or a state of passive dullness leading to all the miseries of irresponsible mediumship.

Hence this passage from the conscious to the so-called unconscious is a very difficult and critical process. This *Samadhi* is called *Nirodhparin·am* or the transformation of the mind into interceptions. It is called the *Dharmparin·am* or the transformation of the thing's property. The intercepting impressions must rise so often as to become a habit, for then alone their flow will become deep and steady and lead to the highest *Samadhi*.[39] The mind is as it were quite annihilated, for no transformation exists. The permanence of this state is all that is desired.

So this trance-transformation is the setting and rising of distractions and concentration respectively- distractions, i.e., of the mind which draw it off from unconscious *Samadhi* i.e. concentration. Interceptions being repeated gain a certain firmness and ripen into unconscious *Samadhi*. Hence when this stage is reached the mere negative condition becomes as it were positive and there arises concentration on nothing, to use a paradoxical phrase. The moment when the mind arrives at this stage in its transformations is called *Avasthaparin*·am. What is the state of mind of the moment of complete unconscious *Samadhi*? The mind is conscious of nothing except the respective repression and revival of certain impressions, viz. distractions and interceptions, both welded in one act of supreme consciousness.[40] This is called *Avasthaparin·am* or transformation as to condition. The mind has its property first transformed. Then this property is joined to a certain moment of time, then the first transformation becomes perfectly ripe and indicates the real condition

of the mind. Then it is easy to see that transformation though essentially one is for the sake of explanation and analysis described as threefold.

23. In the *Yoga* philosophy the theory of transformation of the mind is extended to all objects, for there is nothing which is not compounded of one or more or all of the three properties (passivity, activity and grossness) which are ever in a state of transformation. When the very property of a thing is altered it is called property-transformation or *Dharmprin·*am. When afterwards the thing with its altered property becomes manifest in relation to some time, past, present or future, it is called its (rather its property's) character transformation or *Lakshanparin·am*, for without the limitation of time it is difficult to characterize or define the nature of any conceivable entity. When after this the particular property thus defined ripens into maturity or decay, it is called its condition-transformation or *Avasthaparin·am*. Thus the whole universe consists of nothing but certain objects and their properties which later by their transformation produce all variety. Thus this philosophy puts forth an explanation of the phenomenal universe in accordance with the doctrine of the S*ankhya*

Let us now see how the *Yoga* philosophy explains what the object or the substratum of those properties is. The doctrine *'Ex nihilo Nihau fit*' is carried out to its full extent by this school and therefore it is held that anything can never manifest itself in any other thing unless it previously existed there. This manifestation has reference only to the properties of things and it cannot be said what will come out of what. In fact every thing is producible for everything, for everything potentially exists in the root of all, the *Prakriti*. All this however takes place in relation to the form in which a thing manifests itself, and this form is none other than the unique combination of the three original properties. The properties can never exist but in relation to some substratum which in its turn can never become cognizable but through the properties. The properties, which have once manifested themselves and passed into oblivion are called tranquil, for they have played their part and are still there to become actively manifest some other day. Those that are seen at any moment are called active, whereas those not yet manifest are consigned to the realm of possibility or the indescribable. In other words these possible manifestations are as yet latent. Thus the object or the substratum of properties is that which is correlated to the properties in one or the other of the three states. In the opinion of the *Yoga* philosophers therefore whatever form anything manifests itself as the phenomena is nothing mare than a mere succession of properties in one or other of the three conditions and the universe with all its phenomena is nothing more than an incessant and immediate succession of states of properties.

24. We have digressed from our discussion of the last three stages of *Yoga* to a discussion of the 'substratum and its transformations' theory of the *Yoga* philosophy. But in doing so I had a purpose. The *Yoga* philosophy claims that by performing *Sanyam* on the transformations the past and future of their substratum is at once revealed to the mind.

25. There is another result claimed by the *Yogists* to follow from *Sanyam* and based on a theory to which we are now coming. Every school of philosophy has its own theory about the relation between word and meaning but it would be sufficient here to observe that the *Yoga* philosophy accepts what is generally known as the *Sphote* doctrine. *Sphote* is a something indescribable which eternally exists apart from the letters forming any word and is yet inseparably connected with it, for it reveals itself on the utterance of that word. In like manner the meaning of a sentence is also revealed, so to speak, from the collective sense of the words used. So then, the eternal sense of a word is always different from the letters making that word; and the knowledge which in its turn is conveyed to our mind is equally apart from these two. The sense of words is generally classified under four heads: objects, properties, actions and abstractions; and the impressions into which our mind transforms itself at the moment of cognizing is the knowledge produce. In ordinary intercourse it so happens that the letters, the sense and the knowledge all are so confused together as not to be separable from one another. Thus letters i.e. sounds, being confused with sense and knowledge, convey no precise meaning if they happen to be beyond our previous acquaintance. The fact however is that every meaning is eternally existent and is as eternally connected with particular sounds and therefore conveys or reveals the same sense where ever it is uttered. Acting on this theory and performing *Sanyam* on the three, i.e. sounds, sense and knowledge, separately the yogi comprehends the sense of all sounds uttered by any sentient being in nature.[48] Even so can the music of nature be heard and the joyous *Nad* within be cognized and understood.

26. *Sanyam* is also claimed to produce knowledge of former births. In all the philosophies based on the *Veda*s, as well as in Buddhism and Jainism, transmigration of the soul-re-incarnation from one body to another-is the one doctrine which runs parallel in all of them. As to the grounds on which it is based, we will fully discuss them when we come to Jainism. In this place however we have simply to refer to the *Yoga* doctrine that by performing Sanyam, which is the same thing as complete mental presentation, on the impressions inherent in the mind from time immemorial, there arises knowledge of previous incarnations.

27. *Yoga* also claims that *Sanyam* leads to the power of mind reading. When a yogi performs Sanyam with reference to any sign as the complexion, the voice or any such thing, he at once understands the state of the mind of which these are the sure indices. Anybody's mind can thus be easily comprehended by the yogi, i.e., he understands the state of the mind. In order to understand the subject occupying the mind of that person, he has of course to perform *Sanyam* on that subject.

28. This philosophy also claims that by performing. *Sanyam* in a certain way you can even cause the body to disappear. The theory on this point is this. When light, the property of *Sativa*, emanates from our body and becomes united with the organ of sight which again is a reservoir of similar light, visual perception follows. Following this theory {when} the yogi performs *Sanyam* on the form of his body, i.e. the property that endows

visibility to his body, he disserves the connection between the light from his body and the eye of the cognizer and thus follows the disappearance of the body. The yogi in fact centers all this visibility in his thinking principal and prevents the perception of his body. The same holds true of the other organs of his sense and hence of sounds, sensations (touch sensations?) etc.

29. There is a *Sanyam* on *karma* also *Karma* of course means past actions and they are divided by the *Yoga* philosophy into two divisions- active and dormant. That *karma*) which produces its result speedily and is actually on the way to bear fruit is called active, whereas that which is only in a latent condition of potency is called dormant. By performing *Sanyam* on these two classes of *Karma* the *yogi* knows the time of the cessation of his life. He knows at once which will produce what fruit and therefore at once sees the condition of his death.

The same knowledge also arises from portents in the case of a yogi.[53] Portents are corporeal, celestial or physical. The corporeal are such as the inaudibility of the Pran· in the stomach on closing the ears. The celestials are such as the sight of things generally regarded invisible as heaven etc. The physical consists in seeing extra-ordinary or frightful beings etc. These and similar portents such as dreams, the chance hearing of certain words etc. indicate, to use a common expression, which way the wind blows. But none but yogis can make use of any such portents, for it is only they who can precisely interpret them.

30. The *Sanyam* has also its variety of effects by being practiced things.[54] Of course, by *Sanyam* we mean three stages; contemplation, absorption and trance. By performing *Sanyam* with reference to sympathy, compassion and complacency each of these feelings becomes so strong as to produce the desired result at any moment.[55] In fact he finds no difficulty in enlisting the good will and friendship of any one at any moment.

31. By performing *Sanyam* on the powers of elephant or any animal the yogi acquires those powers.[56] By contemplation on the inner light of the *Sanyam* is acquired the knowledge of subtle things such as invisible atoms, obscure things such as hidden treasures and mines and things which are unapproachably remote.[57] By contemplation on the sun, the knowledge of the space intercepted between the earth and the sun is acquired. By contemplation on the moon the knowledge of the starry region is acquired.[59] By contemplation on the pole star is produced the knowledge of the relative motions and positions of the stars and planets.[60] Such are the powers which the contemplation on the external world brings to the yogi.

32. We now come to powers, which he obtains by contemplation on the parts of his body. In the *Yoga* philosophy the theory is that there are *padma* or plexuses formed by nerves and ganglia at different places in the body. The are generally believed to be seven in number. The most important of these, so far as the arrangement of the nerves of the body is concerned, is the *Nabhichakra* or the navel circle. It is the pivot of the whole system.

Hence *Sanyam* on it leads to knowledge of the conditions of the body.[61] We will now come to the other parts of the body. And the first, the pit of the throat. This is the region about the pharynx where the breath from the mouth and the nostrils meets. It is said that the contact of *Pran* with this region produces hunger and thirst, which therefore may be checked by performing *Sanyam* on this part to neutralize the effects of the contact.[62] It may be remarked that the fifth nerve-circle called *Vishudhchakr* is situated somewhere about the same region and anyone who is able to concentrate his breath in that circle and upward easily acquires freedom from hunger and thirst besides other powers. Next we come to the Koormnaṙee or the nerve where in the breath called *Koorm*, and *Sanyam* on this leads to such a fixate of the body as to make it completely steady and immoveable.[63]

Next there is the light in the head, i.e. the collective flow of the light of *Satv* which is seen at the *Brahamranghr* which is variously supposed to be somewhere near the coronal artery, the pineal gland or over the medulla oblongata. Just as the light of a house presents a luminous appearance at the keyhole, so even does the light of *Satv* show itself at the crown of head. This light is very familiar to all acquainted even slightly with *Yoga* practices and is seen even by concentration on the space between the eyebrows. By *Sanyam* on this light is acquired the sight of the yogis called *Siddha*, i.e. experts in such wonderful sciences so that (sciences with the aid of which?) you can see things not withstanding the obstacles of space and other things.[64] But the real object of *Yoga* seems to obtain the prefect intuitive power which results from *Pratibha*[65]. *Pratibha* is that degree of intellect which develops itself without any special cause and which is capable of leading to real knowledge. It corresponds to what is generally called intuition. If the yogi tries simply to develop this faculty in him by performing *Sanyam* on the intellect he becomes able to accomplish all that we have referred to before, only through the help of *Pratibha*. This sort of *Pratibha* is called *Tarak gyan* the knowledge that saves i.e. leads to final absolution *Moksh*. Hence that *Yoga* which entirely concerns itself with this department of intellectual and spiritual development is often called *Tarakyog* or *Rajyog*.

We come to other parts of the body. *Sanyam* on heart, by which is meant a nerve-circle called *Anahat*, leads to a knowledge to the mind of others as well as one's own.[66]

33. *Sanyam* on the *Purush*- soul itself-leads to the knowledge of soul.[67] The *Sankhya* as well as the *Yoga* lays great stress on the point that *Sanyam*, the source of intelligence, is apart and distinct from the ultimate essence of consciousness. The theory is that *Purush* being reflected in the clear *Satv* enlivens it, and all experience is assumed by the *Satv* so enlivened to be entirely its own act. This confused identification of the two, ever distinct by nature, is the cause if all varied experience. The experience, which the Satv receives, is of no use to itself. It is all for *Purush*; for all the actions of *Prakriti*, which is the source of Satv, and the correlative of *Purush* is for *Purush*. Hence the action of *Satv* is for another and not for itself. Therefore the *Sanyam* on self; i.e. on *Purush* right nature and purpose, will lead to a clear knowledge of *Purush*. And thence is produced cognition without the intervention of the organs of sense, i.e. intuition cognition of sound, touch, light, taste and

smell.[68] The wonderful or, if we may choose to say so, occult powers described hitherto are often all positive obstacles in the way of *Samadhi,* i.e. *Yoga* proper whose nature and import is that state in which the soul sees itself. The author of the *Yoga Sutras* distinctly says that the occult powers serve as obstacles because they become the cause of distracting the mind by the various feelings they excite.[69] Of course, they are not quite useless in as much as they are powers for good in moments when *Samadhi* is suspended. After all, so far as the *Samadhi* highest spiritual aim is concerned, and certainly that is the aim of all philosophies, the exercise of these powers is a positive obstacle on the way to *Samadhi*. This is clearly stated in the *Yoga Sutras*. But in the *Yoga* aphorisms published by Mr. Judge of New York this portion is mistranslated (See Judge's *Yoga Sutras*).

34. The breath in the body is divided into five classes. The air intercepted between the tip of the nose and heart is called *Pran*,that between the heart and the navel is called, *Sman*, that from the navel to the toes of the feet is called *Upan*, that above the tip of nose is called *Udan* and the which pervades the whole body is called *Vyan*. Their respective functions are vitalizing, digestions, expulsion of the excrements, raising up the sound etc. and motion is general. The *Udan* air has the tendency to raise the body upward and carry it above water etc. Hence by mastery over *Udan* there arises the power of ascension, non-contact with water, mud, thorn etc.[70] With reference to the *Sman* breath, the part about the navel is this seat where it performs the function of digestion by keeping the internal fire. When *Sanyam* is performed on *Sman*, this fire can be seen about the whole body which will on that account appear effulgent.[71] This effulgence is most perceptible about the head, between the eye-brows and at the navel. It is said to be the basis of the magnetic currents of living beings.

35. By *Sanyam* on the relation between ether which is the substratum of sound-vibrations and the sense of hearing arises the power of clair-audience.[72] By *Sanyam* on the relation between the body and the *Akash* (ether) arises the power of passing through endless space.[73] And There are many other powers which the *Yoga* claims can arise by reason of performing *Sanyam* on different things.

36. The true yogi does not attach himself to these occult powers. And the *Yoga Sutra* expressly says in one of its aphorisms that it is by non-attachment to this that *Kaivalya* the highest spiritual knowledge is attained.[74]

36. 37. We will now discuss this final aim of *Yoga*. In doing so we will have to refer once more to the nature and doings of *Prakriti*. There are many hundred points for which the *Yoga* philosophy offers its solution. For instance, how is one body changed into another is that the flow of *Prakriti* does it all,[75] the flow of *Prakriti* i.e. that inscrutable action of matter which performs all the work of transformation as seen in the material universe. The very potencies of matter do all and by powerful application produce the necessary conditions for independent action. The incidental cause in the production of material results, are our virtuous and vicious actions. It may be asked if *Prakriti* does all by its

action and produces transformations equal to its potentialities, where is the use of individual good or bad actions. The performance of such acts is not useful in setting up the action of *Prakriti* but it only prepares the way for its free action by removing if good the obstruction in its way. An illustration in point is that of a husband's man who only removes the obstacles in the way of the water which then passes of itself from one spot to another.[76] If the performance of good acts removes all obstacles and prepares the way for the free action of *Prakriti*, a *yogi*, whose vision reveals to him all he has still to go through, may with, as it were, to multiply himself and thus undergo at one and the same time the fruition of all that is to happen. In this he would require, as many minds as there are bodies and the question would arise, whence do these come, it being taken for granted that a yogi can duplicate his gross body. Such a yogi has full command over *Mhat the* root of all egoism and everything else, which makes up "mind". The sense of being or individuality is the result of *Mhat* and the yogi who has command over it is able to send forth as many minds as he likes from this grand reservoir.[77] And as the one mind of the yogi is the cause of all the minds in their various activities the same individual is preserved in all the different bodies with different minds.[78] These newly created minds are not susceptible to impressions, they being produced by means of *Samadhi* and because *yogis* do not acquire impression by actions.[79] Actions or *Karma* are considered under four heads; white, black mixed and indifferent. The first are of gods, the second of wicked beings, the third of men and the fourth of yogis.[80] In other words, yogis acquire no impression by their acts, for they are perfect in non-attachment and hence are ever considered free. From the first three kinds of *Karma* those impressions alone are developed for which the conditions are favorable. In other words, every act leaves an impression and these are collected one upon the other, and new ones added to them as any of them spends itself away by producing its proper result under proper conditions. Only those impressions manifest themselves for which conditions are favourable.[81] For example, if a being who is a man becomes a man again, after passing through the dog, the wolf and the ape, it is certain that such impressions alone will manifest themselves in each or any of these existences as are favored by the conditions.

38. Patajali the author of *Yoga Sutras* discusses from these facts many metaphysical points about the nature of mind and soul. We will however come at once to the final emancipation or *Kaivalya*. And first the qualifications of one, who attains to it. One who has the desire to know what the soul is and what relation his mind and the universe bear to it is said to be desirous of *Kaivalya*. When such a person clearly experiences the distinction between mind and soul and understands the power and nature of either the said desire is distinguished within him.[82] *Kaivalya* is in fact a state in which there is entire cessation of all desire and when the nature of the essence of all consciousness is known there is no room for any action of the mind the source of phenomena. The mind before such knowledge was bent towards worldly objects but now it is entirely bent on discrimination knowledge. This knowledge is of the kind of clear cognition of the different between mind and soul. Not only this but mind is entirely full of the idea of *Kaivalya* to the exclusion of other thoughts[83]. But while the condition of entire devotion to *Kaivalya* is

suspended, there are other thoughts from previous impression or impressions of previous births[84]. These impressions are to be destroyed like other distraction[85]. Even full discrimination is not the desired end and should be suspended by supreme non-attachment which is the nearest road to *Samadhi*, the door of *Kaivalya* [86]. From constant discriminative recognition of the 26 elements of this philosophy results the lights of knowledge; after this the *yogi* works entirely without attachment to any object of desire; then he reaches the state of supreme non-attachment, wherein the lights of soul breaks out in full. In fact all appears full of soul and there is nothing to interrupt this blissful perception. Then all distortion and action cease altogether at least for the yogi[87]. When the distraction are destroyed and when *Karma* and is rendered powerless for good or for ill, there arises full knowledge which is free from the obscuration caused by *Rajas* and *Tames* and cleared of all impurities arising from the distractions. This knowledge is infinite. As compared to this infinity, that which ordinary men regard as knowable appears but as insignificantly small things.[88] It is easy to know it any time though is not possible that the desire to know a comparatively worthless thing should ever arise.

While such knowledge arises and supreme non-attachment is at highest there arises in the *yogi* entire cessation of the effects of three Gun˙, the properties. The properties work for the *Purush*; the *Purush* having known himself the properties cease to act, they having fulfilled their end.[89] The whole universe is but a succession of transformation upon transformation of properties.[90] These transformations take an inverse source till all is reduced to matter with the three qualities. No fresh transformations comes take place and hence the succession of transformation comes to an end on the case of the *Purush* who has understood *Kaivalya*.[91] Their effects the various transformation merge onto the higher source and nothing remains for the *Purush* to cognize. This state of the *Purush* is *Kaivalya* or the state of singleness. It dose not mean that the universe is reduced to nothing, for it continues to exist for all those who have not acquired knowledge. In the case of one who has not acquired knowledge, the visible universe, the cause of distraction, the state of concentration, the supreme idea of non-attachment, all with their impression merge into the mind, which again merges into mere being, which resolves itself in *Mahat*, which finally loses itself in *Prakriti*. This *Kaivalya* of *Prakriti* is by way of metaphor said to be of *Purush*. Or *Kaivalya* may be explained from the side of the *Purush*. When the *Purush* has so far received due illumination as to estrange itself from all relation with *Prakriti* and its transformations it is said to be *Kaivalya (Kaival)* alone or in a state of *Kaivalya*. This is the power of soul centered in itself. *Kaivalya* is not any state of negation or annihilation as some are misled to think. The soul in *Kaivalya* has his sphere of action transferred to a higher plane limited by a limitless horizon. This, our limited minds cannot hope to understand.

References:

1. As a matter of fact, the *Sankhya* school- at least what is known as 'Classical *Sankhya*'-is only partly materialistic.

2. The exact import of the statement that the mind is a result of *Rajas* is somewhat obscure; but if 'mind' here stands for *Buddhi* and *Satv* for the *Satvgun*, then Gandhi is perhaps saying that in *Buddhi* there is a greater preponderance of *Rajas* than it is there in the original *Prakriti*.

3. It is not clear what is precisely meant by saying that mind has special attributes. Maybe it simply means that mind has a specific nature of its own, but that is hardly worth saying.

4. YS 3.55

5. YS 1.2

6. Note how Gandhi concedes the possibility of a practicing yogi acquiring miraculous capacities but at the same time under-emphasizes this aspect of the matter.

7. In view of the standard enumeration of elements adopted by the *Sankhya Yoga* system *Chit* should not be an element over and above *Manas* and *Ahamkar*, and *Buddhi*, which three are collectively called *Antakaran*. At places, *Buddhi* alone is called *Antakaran* and as a matter of fact the usual practice is to identify *Chit* with *Buddhi*; as *Vachaspati* in the *Tattvavaisharadi* on YS1.1 says: *Chitashbdain Antakaran Budhdhimupakshyati*.

8. YS1.3

9. YS1.4

10. YS 1.6-11

11. YS 1.12

12. YS 1.17-18.

13. YS 2.29.

14. YS 2.30.

15. YS 2.32

16. YS 2.35

17. YS 2.36

18. YS 2.37

19. YS 2.38; One word in Gandhi's Sentence is illegible (it reads like `actute').

20. YS 2.39

21. YS 2.41

22. YS 2.42

23. YS 2.43

24. YS 2.44

25. YS 2.45

26. YS 2.46

27. HP 1.57-65; Here again one word is illegible (it reads like 'whicy').

28. YS 2.49; Vy.2.49

29. *Sushumn̩a* is spinal cord and it is a sign of balanced breathing that the *Pran̩* runs in the middle course represented by *Sushumn̩a*. *Unmanee* is the word, which in the *Hatha Yoga Pradipika* stands for the highest type of *Smadhi* i.e. for *Nirviklpaksmadhiv*. But it is not easy to see why Gandhi here uses the word *unman*i *mudra* instead of the simple *unman̩i*.

30. HP 2.1-20

31.YS 2.54. The meaning is: 'the imitation of the thinking principal on the part of the senses, by withdrawing themselves from their objects.'

32. YS 3.1

33. YS 3.2

34. YS 3.3

35. Gandhi's meaning is that the hypnotize medium' too is forgetful of all idea of being active but that he is not concentrating his mind on anything; this is so because whatever

positive observations the 'medium' makes are due to the hypnotizing 'suggestion' rather than to an endeavor on the part of the 'medium' himself.

36. YS3.4

37. YS.3.7

38. YS.3.8

39. YS3.10

40. YS3.11

41.As will be explained just below, a thing undergoes transformation by means of its various properties, a thing's property undergoes transformation by means of its temporal conditions like 'past-ness', 'present-ness', 'future-ness', while a temporal condition of a thing's property undergoes transformation by means of its states like 'raw-ness', 'ripe-ness' etc. The technical name for 'thing' is *Dharma*, for 'property' *Dharma*, for temporal condition " *Lakshan* ", and for 'state' *Avastha*. Hence *Vyas* (in the course of his commentary on YS 3.13):

42. YS3.13

43. This statement seems inaccurate; for according to the *Sankhya* philosopher the properties, which have played their part, are still there no doubt but they do not become actively manifest some other day.

44. YS 3.14

45. YS 3.15

46. YS 3.16

47. As judged from the next sentence, the argument seems to be that since ordinarily a word becomes meaningful to us, only in case someone tells us, that such is the meaning of this word, what we ordinarily do is to confuse a word with its meaning, or with the knowledge this word conveys.

48. YS 3.17

49. YS 3.18

50. YS 3.19

51. YS 3.21

52. YS 3.22

53. YS 3.22

54. It is not possible to correct this sentence.

55. YS 3.23

56. YS 3.24

57. YS 3.25

58. YS 3.26

59. YS 3.27

60. YS 3.28

61. YS 3.29

62. YS 3.30

63. YS 3.33

64. YS 3.32

65. YS 3.33

66. YS 3.34

67. YS. 3.35; Gandhi speaks as if *Sanyam* on the *Purush* is *Sanyam* on a part of the body, but it will be better to treat this *Sanyam* as an independent item. Hence our separation of its treatment from that of the rest.

68. YS 3.36

69. YS 3.37

70. YS 3.39

71. YS 3.40

72. YS 3.41

73. YS 3.42

74. YS 3.50; As can be seen, Gandhi's sentence needs completion

75. YS 4.2

76. YS 4.3

77. YS 4.4

78. YS 4.5

79. YS 4.6

80. YS 4.7

81. YS 4.8

82. YS. 4.25

83. YS. 4.26

84. YS 4.27

85. YS 4.28

86. YS 4.29

87. YS 4.30

88. YS 4.31

89. YS 4.32

90. YS 4.33

91. YS 4.34

III

THE *NAYA* PHILOSOPHY

1. Having finished our discussion on the *Sankhya* and its counterpart the *Yoga* philosophy we now enter upon the *Naya* of Gautama with its supplement the *Vaisheshika*.

The author or rather the recognized promulgator of the *Naya* philosophy is Gautama. This philosophy starts with the proposition that in order to obtain the *summum bonum* one must acquire the knowledge of the truth; knowledge of the truth drives away miseries, births, mundane existence, faults and false knowledge and the result is *Moksha*, the freedom of the soul. How can the knowledge of the truth be obtained? Gautama says: 'Knowledge of sixteen topics leads to *Moksha*. What are these sixteen topics? They are all connected with the process of reasoning and the laws of thought.[1] We do not find in *Naya* any prominence given to the rational demonstration of the universe. This we shall find in its complement the *Vaisheshika*. The *Naya* therefore teaches us the method of investigation, the *Vaisheshika* following that method actually tries to investigate into the nature of the universe.

2. The *Naya* mode of investigation may seem very peculiar to those who are not acquainted with the Hindu mode of thinking but it is quite Indian and unique. It says that if you wish to investigate into the nature of things you must proceed first to mention *Udaish*, then give the *Lakshan·* of those things and lastly to make *Pareeksha*. I shall explain these terms. First you have to mention *Udaish*, i.e. only to name the things by their respective names. Then you have to give the Lakshan· of those things, i.e. give the differentia of those things-differentia, i.e. those qualities which belong to them only and to nothing else and which at the same time are their essential qualities, i.e. qualities without which they cannot exist. This means that after naming them you have to give their logical definitions. And thirdly you have to examine whether those definitions are right. The sixteen topics of *Naya* philosophy are treated in that way. We shall proceed with them in order.

3. The first is *Prman·*, i.e. the means or instruments by which *Pram* or the right measure of any subject is to be obtained. These are the different processes by which the mind arrives at a true and accurate knowledge. These processes are four *Prtyaksh*, *Anuman*, *Upman*, and *Shabd*. We shall describe them when we come to the *Vaisheshika* philosophy.[3] The second topic is *Prmaiya* by which is meant all the objects or subjects of right knowledge. They are twelve in number: *Atma* (soul), Shreer (body), Indriyas (organs

or senses), *Arth* (objects of sense), *Buddhi* (understanding or intellect), *Man* (mind), *Prvriti* (activity), *Dosh* (faults), *Praityabhav* (transmigration), *Phal* consequences or fruits), *Dukha* (pain), *Apvarg* (emancipation). These are the twelve of which we have to get the right knowledge by any one of the four processes. The other fourteen topics are not different categories under which things can be classed but rather regular stages through which a logical controversy is to pass. For instance, in discussing a topic there is first the state of *Sanshaya* or doubt about the point to be discussed. Next there must be a *Pryojan* or motive for discussing it. Next a *drishant* or a familiar example must be adduced in order that a *Sidhant* or established conclusion may be arrived at. These four with the former two *Prman*· and *Prmaiya*, make up six. The seventh is *Avayava*, i.e. the argument of the objector split up. The eighth is *Tark* or refutation of his objection. The ninth is *Nirnaya* or coming to a conclusion. But this is not enough for the *Naya* philosopher. He thinks that every side of a question must be examined, every possible objection stated and so a further *Vad* or controversy takes place which of course leads to *Jalpa* (mere wrangling), followed by *Vitanda (*caviling), *Haitvabhas* (fallacious reasoning), *Chhala* (quibbling artifices), *Jati* futile replies), and *Nigrahsthan* (the putting an end to all discussion by a demonstration of the objector's incapacity for argument). These are *Gautama's* sixteen topics.

4. The most important part of the [philosophy] is the *Vaisheshika* system.[3] The *Naya* of Gautama does not aim at a {demonstration of the] universe. The aim of every [philosophy] ought to be to give an [analytical] demonstration of the [universe, it being] the way for obtaining the summum bonum. The *Naya* only mentions the objects or subjects to be known but it is *Kanada*, the author of the *Vaisheshika*, who tries to analyze the things and then lays down that final liberation- the summum bonum -follows the right understanding of things. His method is that of generalization. He arranges all the nameable objects, their properties or abstractions even, under seven categories. Let us place ourselves in his position and look at the universe as he does; then only we will be able to understand his philosophy.

5. We [observe] things around us; we see uniformity [and variety] in them. What is that [uniformity and what] is that variety? That [something which] is common to many things, which [is all- pervading] and is without beginning or end [accounts for] uniformity. Notwith ..... objects, we see variety in them(?); [notwithstanding] common properties found in all of them, there is something which individualizes them. This is variety. The *Vaisheshika* called uniformity or generality *Samanya* and variety or individuality *Vishaish*. They are the same as genus and species. But this generality and individuality do not exist by themselves. They exist in something. That something which is the tabernacle of qualities or energies is what the *Vaisheshika* calls *Dravya* (substance). He thinks that the qualities and energies or actions are separate entities and therefore ought to be classed under separate categories. The first are what he calls *Gun*· (Qualities), the second are *Karma* (actions). We saw before that generality or individuality does not exist without a substance; so there must be some intimate relation between them; in the same manner, we

do not see qualities or actions except in substances; (so) there must be an intimate relation between substances and their qualities or actions. This relation is classified by the *Vaisheshika* under a separate category and is named *Samvay* or perpetual intimate relation. Thus all the objects can be classed under six heads *Dravya* (substance), *Gun (Quality)*, *Karma* (actions), *Samanya* (generality), *Vishaish* (individuality) and *Samvaye* (the perpetual relation). There is nothing in the universe outside these six categories. In order however to include negative qualities into the nameable objects- as darkness which
is the absence of light, a seventh category called *Abhav* or non-existence or negation of existence is added to the six mentioned before.

6. We will now proceed with these categories one by one.

(i) The first is *Dravya* or substance. Kanada divides them into nine classes- *Prithvi* (earth), *Jal* (water), *taijasa* (light), Vayu (air), *Akash* (ether), *Kal* (time), *Dik* (space), *Atma* (soul), *Manas* (mind). These are the nine substances, each existing as an entity. There is no substance, material or spiritual, outside these nine.

(ii)

(iii) (ii)The second category is *Gun* or quality. According to this philosophy there are only 24 qualities and no more. These are *Roop* (color), *Res* (savor or taste), *Gandha* (odor), *Sparsh* (tangibility), *Sankhya* (number), *Pariman* (dimension), *Prithkatv* (individuality), *Sanyoga* (conjunction), *Vibhaga* (disjunction, *Pratv* (priority), *Apratv* (posteriority), (intellect), *Sukha* (pleasure), *Dukha* (pain), *Ichha* (desire, *Dvaish* (aversion), *Pryatn* (volition), *Gurutva* (gravity), *Dravatv* (fluidity), *Snaih* (viscidity), *Sanskar* (self-productiveness), *Dharma* (merit),*Adharma* (demerit), and *Shabd* (sound).

(iii)The third category action is fivefold: *Utkshaipan* (Elevation or throwing upwards), *Avkshaipan* (Depression or throwing downwards), *Akunchan* (contraction), *Sanprsaran* (dilatation), and *Gaman* (motion in general).
(iv) The fourth category is *samanya* (generality). It is twofold, higher and lower. All the different objects thought different one from each other are known as substance. Their being substance is the highest generalization.[5]

But these different objects may be divided into several classes, each class differing from the other. All the objects included in one class have a lower generality and so on.

(v) The fifth category *Vishaish* (individuality) is of infinite nature. Each atom is separate from the other. And therefore there are infinite individualities.

(vi) The sixth category *Samvay* or intimate relation is that which exists between a substance and it qualities, between atoms and, what is formed out of them, between the whole and its parts, between atoms and what is formed out of them, between the whole and its parts, between substance and its modifications.

(vii) The seventh category is non-existence, which is very easy to understand.

7. We will examine these categories a little closer.
(a) Of the nine substances, earth, water, light and air are considered eternal and non-eternal. The atoms of these substances are eternal but their different manifestations are not eternal. With regard to the creation of the universe the *Vaisheshika* supports the atomic theory and states that the material universe is created out of these four elements. The *Vaisheshika* believe in a personal creator because they think that although the elements were here yet there must be some one to form them into different shapes. For the formation of a pot, although the clay is there, still there is the necessity of a potter. By the will of this divine power motion is imparted to the atoms and evolution follows.

(b) Besides these four elementary substances, there are five other substances-ether, time, space, soul and mind. These are eternal and all of them except mind are all- pervading, i.e. they exist everywhere. This means that the soul of every man exists as much in Chicago as in Bombay. The mind however is atomic and is connected with soul. When the soul becomes related with mind knowledge is the result; knowledge is a special characteristic of soul, but it is mind, which receives the sensation of pleasure or pain. The different senses are only the instruments of knowledge. The effects of acts are stored in the mind and they manifest themselves as pleasures and pains in future incarnations. When by the grace of god the soul acquires the right knowledge of things all miseries vanish and the supreme bliss follows.

REFERENCES:

1. NS1.1-2

2. The promise is not kept- at least, not in the available manuscript

3. The manuscript is partly torn here and so the completion thereof is conjectural.

4. Here again the manuscript is partly torn and its completion- where ever possible- conjectural.

5. Really speaking, the highest generality is *Sata* and it belongs to the substances, qualities and actions-inasmuch as these substances etc. though different from each other can all be called *Sat.*

6. This characterization of *Vishaish* is obscure. As a matter of fact, not only each atom but each substance supposed to be eternal- i.e. each soul, each mind, space, time, ether has got its own *Vishaish*. And it is a good definition of *Vishaish* that it is what distinguished an eternal substance from every other substance. To take *Vishaish* to mean species as

contrasted to genus-which is what *Samanya* then stands for- is a loose way of speaking. But the usage actually occurs in the early *Vaisheshika* authors and Gandhi was not being un-authentic in having followed their practice (towards the beginning of his exposition of the Vaisheshika system).

7. This account of *Samvaye* is neither exact nor complete. For the case of certain atoms forming a composite body is in fact a case of parts forming a whole. And the *Samvaye* relation obtains also between a *Samanya* and its locus and a *Vishaish* and its locus.

8. This account of mind is extremely sketchy, so the following might be added. Knowledge as well as pleasure and pain (together with several others) are the qualities of soul and mind is the organ of `internal perception', that is, the organ for perceiving the qualities of soul- just as eyes etc. are the organs of `external perception', that is the organ for perceiving the qualities of physical substances. And the soul's connection with mind is required stances. And the soul's connection with mind is required not for the production of knowledge alone but for that of each quality of soul.

IV

MIMAMSA

1. The next school of thought to which we come the *Mimasma* of Jaimini. *Jaimini's* system cannot really be called a philosophy. It is rather a system of ritualism. It dose not concern itself with investigation into the nature of soul, mind, matter but with a correct interpretation of the ritual of the *Veda* and the solutions of doubts and discrepancies in regard to Vedic texts caused by the discordant explanations of opposite schools, It is therefore a critical commentary on the ritual portion of the *Veda*. We shall therefore at once pass to the *Vedanta* philosophy.

V

THE *VEDANTA* PHILOSOPHY

1. The whole *Vedanta* philosophy is based on the *Upanishad* portion of the *Vedas*. The *Chhandogya Upanishad* contains several allegories, which have become the starting point of the philosophy.

There is, for example, a dialogue in the Chhandogya Upanishad between a young student

Shwetaketu and his father Uddalaka Aruni, in which the father tries to convince the son, that with all his theological learning, he knows nothing and then tries to lead him on to the highest knowledge, the *Tatvmai* or `thou art that'. The father said to him, "Shwetaketu, go to school, for there is none belonging to our race, darling, who not having studied, is, as it were, a *Brahman* by birth only.

He began his apprenticeship with a teacher when he was 12 years of age. He returned home when he was 24, having then studied all the Vedas- conceited, considering him well-read and very stern. His father said, to him, " Shwetaketu, as you are so conceited, considering yourself so well read and so stern, my dear, have you asked for that instruction by which we hear what is not audible, by which we perceive what is not perceptible, by which we know what is unknowable." "What is that instruction, Sir?" he asked. The father replied," My dear, as by one clod of clay all that is made a clay is known, the difference being only a name arising from speech, but the truth being that all is clay; and as, my dear, by one nugget of gold all the is made of gold is known, the difference being only a name arising from speech, but the truth being only a name arising from speech, but truth being that all is gold; and, as my dear, by one pair of nail scissors all that is made of iron is known, the difference being only a name arising from speech, but the truth being that all is iron. Thus, my dear, is that instruction." The son said, "Surely those venerable men (my teachers) did not know that. For if they had known it why should they not have told it me? Do you, Sir therefore, tell me that."

The father said, "In the beginning, my dear, there was that only which, is, one only without a second. Others say, in the beginning there was that only which is not, one only without a second; and from that which is not, that which is was born. But how could it be thus, my dear? How could that which is be born of that which is not? No, my dear, only that which is, was in the beginning, one without a second. It thought, may I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth fire. That fire thought, may I be many, May I grow forth. It sent forth water. Water thought, may I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth. It sent forth fire. That fire thought, may I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth water. Water thought, may I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth earth (or food). Therefore whenever it rains anywhere, most food is then produced. From water alone is eatable food produced. As the bees, my son, make honey by collecting the juices of descant trees and reduce the juice into one form, and these juices have no discrimination, so that they might say, I am the juice of this tree or that tree, in the same manner, my son, all these creatures when they have become merged in the true (either in deep sleep or death) know not that they are merged in the true. Whatever these creatures are here, whether lion or a wolf or a boar or a worm or a midge or a gnat or a mosquito, that they become again and again. Now that which is the subtle essence, in it all that exists has its self. It is the true. It is the self, and thou, O Shwetaketu, art it."

"Please, Sir, inform me still more", said the son. "Be it so, my child," the father replied. "These rivers, my son, run the eastern like the Ganges to the East, the western like the

Indus to the West. They go from sea to sea, i.e., the clouds lift up the water from the sea to the sky and send it back as rain to sea. They become indeed seas. And as those rivers, when they are in the sea, do not know, I am this or that river, in the same manner, my son, all these creatures when they have come back from the true know not that they have come back from the true. Whatever these creatures are here, whether a lion or a mosquito, that they become again and again. That which is that subtle essence, in it all that exists has its self. It is the true. It is the self, and thou, O Shwetaketu, art it."

"Please, Sir, inform me still more," said the son. "Be it so, my child," the father replied. " If some one were to strike at the root of this large tree here, it would bleed but live. If he were to strike at its stem, it would bleed but live. If he were to strike at its tip, it would bleed but live. Pervaded by the living self that tree stand s firm, drinking in its nourishment and rejoicing. But if life (the living self) leaves one of its branches, that branch withers, if it leaves the whole tree, the whole tree withers. In exactly the same manner, my son, know this. This body indeed withers and dies when the living self has left it; the living self never dies. That which is that subtle essence, in it all that exists has its self. It is the true. It is the self, and thou, O Shwetaketu, art it."

"Please, Sir inform me still more," The son said. "Be it so, my child," the father said. Place this salt in water and then wait on me in the morning." the son did as was commanded. The father said to him, "Bring me the salt which you placed in the water last night," The son having looked for it found it not, for of course it was melted. The son having looked for it found it not, for of course it was melted. The father said, "Taste it from the surface of the water. How is it?" The son replied, " It is salt." "Taste it from the middle, How is it?" "It is salt" "Taste it from the bottom. How is it?" The son said, " It is salt." The father said, " Now leave the vessel and sit by my side." He did so. The father asked, "Where is the salt? Do you see it?" The son said, " I do not see it but it is in the water." The father said, " Here also in this body you do not perceive the true, my son, but there indeed it is. That which is the subtle essence, in it all that exists has its self. It is the true. It is the self, and thou, O Shwetaketu, art it."

"Please, Sir, inform me more." "Be it so, my child. If a man is ill, his relatives assemble round him and ask- dost thou know me? Now as long as his speech is not merged in the mind, his mind in breath, his breath in heat, heat in the highest Godhead, he knows them. But when his speech is merged in his mind, his mind in breath, breath in heat, and heat in the highest Godhead, he knows them not. That which is the subtle essence, in it all that exists has its self. It is the true. It is the self, and thou, O Shwetaketu, art it."

2. I told you last time that the *Vedanta* philosophy is based on the *Upanishads*. The ritual of the *Vedas* was considered the *Karmkand* or the work portion, the Upanishads constituted what is known as *Gyankand* or the knowledge portion in so far as it propounds a certain theory of the world. I also told you that Mimamsa was a system of ritualism which gave a correct interpretation of the ritual of the *Veda* and the solutions of

doubts and discrepancies in regard to *Vedic* texts caused by the discordant explanations of opposite schools. Just as the ritualistic portion of the *Veda*s became object of comment by *Jaimini*, the author of the *Mimamsa* so did Badarayana comment on or rather composed aphorisms based on the Upanishads.

3. The *Vedanta* philosophy has its two chief supporters Shankara and Ramanuja. Both of them rest their doctrines on the Upanishads. In Shankara's opinion the Upanishads teach as follows:

(a) Whatever is, is in reality one; there truly exists only one universal being called Brahma or *Parmatman* (the highest self). This being is of an absolutely homogeneous nature; it is pure being or, which comes to the same, pure intelligence or thought *Chaetanya*, *gyan*. Intelligence or thought is not to be predicated of Brahma as its attribute but constitutes its substance. Brahma is not thinking being, but thought itself. It is absolutely destitute of qualities; whatever qualities or attributes are conceivable can only be denied of it. But if nothing exists but one absolutely simple being, whence the appearance of the world by which we see ourselves surrounded and in which we ourselves exist as individual beings? The answer is that Brahma is associated with a certain power called *Maya* or *Avidya*. This power cannot be called 'being', for 'being' is only Brahma; nor can it be called' not-being' in the strict sense, for it at any rate produces the appearance of this world. It is in fact a principle of illusion, the non-definable cause owing to which there seems to exist a material world comprehending distinct individual existences. Being associated with this principle of illusion Brahma is enabled to project the appearance of the world, in the same way as a magician is enabled by his incomprehensible magical power to produce illusory appearances of animate and inanimate beings. *Maya* thus constitutes the *Upadan* (the material cause) of the world, or if we wish to call attention to the circumstance that *Maya* belongs to Brahma as *Shakti*, we may say that the material cause of the world is Brahma in so far as it is associated with *Maya*. In this latter quality Brahma is more properly called *Ishwar* (the Lord).

Maya under the guidance of the Lord modifies itself by a progressive evolution into all the individual existences distinguished by special names and forms, of which the world consists; from it there spring in due succession the different material elements and the whole bodily apparatus belonging to sentient beings. In all those apparently individual forms of existence the one indivisible Brahma is present, but owing to the particular adjuncts into which (   ) has specialized itself it appears to be broken up-it is broken up, as it were- into a multiplicity of intellectual or sentient principles, the so called *Jeev* (individual or personal souls). What is real in each is only the universal Brahma itself, the whole aggregate of individualizing bodily organs and mental functions, which in our ordinary experience separate and distinguish one *Jeev* from another, is the offspring of *Maya* and as such unreal.

The phenomenal world or world of ordinary experience *Vyvehar* thus consists of a number

of individual souls engaged in specific cognition's, volition's and so on and of the external material objects with which those cognition's and volition's are concerned. Neither the specific cognition's nor their objects are real in the true sense of the world, for both are altogether due to *Maya*. But at the same time we have to reject the idealistic doctrine of certain Buddhist schools according to which nothing whatever truly exists but certain trains of cognition acts or ideas to which no external objects correspond for external things, although not real in the strict sense of the word, enjoy at any rate as much reality as the specific acts, whose objects they are.

(b) The non- enlightened soul is unable to look through and beyond *Maya*, which like a veil hides from it its true nature. Instead of recognizing itself to be Brahman it blindly identifies itself with its adjuncts *Upadhi* - the fictitious off springs of *Maya*, and thus looks for its true self in the body, the sense-organs and the internal organ *Manas*, i.e., the organ of specific cognition. The soul, which in reality is pure intelligence, non-active, infinite, thus becomes limited in extent, as it were, limited in knowledge and power, an agent and enjoyer. Through its actions it burdens itself with merit and demerit, the consequences of which it has to bear or enjoy in series of future embodied existences, the Lord-as retributer and dispenser-allotting to each soul that form of embodiment to which it is entitled by its previous actions. At the end of each of the great world periods called *Kelp*, the Lord retracts the whole world, i.e. the whole material world is dissolved and merged into non-distinct *Maya* while the individual souls, free for the time from actual connection with *Upadhi*, lie in deep slumber as it were. But as the consequences of their former deeds are not yet exhausted they have again to enter an embodied existence as soon as the Lord sends forth a new material world, and the old round of birth, action, death begins anew to last to all eternity as it has lasted from all eternity.

(c) The means of escaping from this endless *Sansara*, the way-out of which can never be found by the non-enlightened soul, are furnished by the *Veda*. The *Karmkand* indeed whose purport it is to enjoin certain actions cannot lead to final release, for even the most meritorious works necessarily lead to new forms of embodied existence. And in the *Gyankand* of the *Veda* also two different parts have to be distinguished, viz. firstly those chapters and passages which treat of Brahma in so far as it is related to the world and hence characterized by various attributes, i.e. of *Ishwar* or lower Brahma, and secondly, those texts which set forth the nature of the highest Brahma transcending all qualities and the fundamental identity of the individual soul with that highest Brahma. Devout meditation on Brahma as suggested by passages of the former kind does not directly lead to final emancipation; the pious worshipper passes on his death into the world of the lower Brahma only, where he continues to exist as a distinct individual soul although in the enjoyment of great power and knowledge-until at last he reaches the highest knowledge and through it final release. That student of the *Veda*, on the other hand, whose soul has been enlightened by the texts embodying the higher knowledge of Brahma, whom passages such as the great saying 'That art thou' have taught that there is no difference between his true self and the highest self, obtains at the moment of the death immediate final release,

i.e. he withdraws altogether from the influence of *Maya* and asserts himself in his true nature which is nothing else but the absolute highest Brahma. This is the teaching of Shankara.

4. According to Ramanuja, on the other hand, the teaching of the Upanishads is a little different.

(a)

(b) a. He says: There exists only one all-embracing being called Brahma or the highest self or the Lord. This being is not destitute of attributes but rather endowed with all imaginable auspicious qualities. It is not intelligence as Shankara maintains but intelligence is its chief attribute. The Lord is all- pervading, all-powerful, all knowing, all merciful; his nature is fundamentally antagonistic to all evil. He contains within himself whatever exists. While according to Shankara, the only reality is to be found in the nonqualified homogenous highest Brahma which can only be defined as pure being or pure thought, all plurality being a mere illusion, Brahma according to Ramanuja's view comprises within itself distinct elements of plurality which all of them lay claim to absolute reality of one and the same kind. Whatever is presented to us by ordinary experience, viz. matter in all its various modifications and the individual souls of different classes and degrees, are essential, real constituents of Brahma's nature. Matter and souls *Achit and Chit* constitute according to Ramanuja's terminology the body of the Lord, they stand to him in the same relation of entire dependence and subservience in which the matter forming an animal or vegetable body stands to its soul or animating principle. The Lord pervades and rules all things which exist- material or immaterial- as their *Anteryamee* the fundamental text for this special Ramanuja's tenet- which in the writing of the sect is quoted again and again- is the so called *Anteryamee Brahman*, which says that within all elements, all sense organs and lastly within all individual souls there abides an inward ruler whose body these elements, sense organs an individual souls constitute. Matter and souls as forming the body of the Lord are also called modes *Prkar* of him. They are to be looked upon as his effects, but they have enjoyed the kind of individual existence, which is theirs from all eternity and will never be entirely resolved in Brahma. They however exist in two different periodically alternating conditions. At some time they exist in a subtle state in which they do not possess those qualities by which they are ordinarily known, and there is then no distinction of individual name and form. Matter in that state is non-evolved *Avyakt* individual souls are not joined to material bodies and their intelligence is in a state of contraction *Sankoch*.

This is the *Prley* State, which recurs at the end of each *Kalpa*, and Brahma is then said to be in its causal condition *Karn·avastha*. To that state all those *Vedic* passage refer which speak of the Brahma or self as being in the beginning one only without a second. Brahma then is indeed not absolutely one, for it contains within itself matter and soul in a germinal condition; but as in that condition they are so subtle as not to allow of individual distinctions being made, they are not counted as something second in addition to Brahma. When the *Prley* state comes to an end, creation takes place owing to an act of volition on

the Lord's part The primary non-evolved matter then passes over into its other condition; it becomes gross and thus acquires all those sensible attributes, visibility, tangibility and so on, which are known from ordinary experience. At the same time the souls enter into connection with material bodies corresponding to the degree of merit or demerit acquired by them in previous forms of existence; their intelligence at the same time undergoes certain expansion *Vikas*. The Lord together with matter in its gross state and the expanded souls is Brahma in the condition of effect *Karyavstha*. Cause and effect are thus at the bottom the same; for he effect is nothing but the cause, which has undergone a certain change *Parin*ˑam. Hence the cause being known, the effect is known likewise.

(b) Owing to the effects of their former actions the individual souls are implicated in the *Sansara*, the endless cycle of birth, action and death, final escape from which is to be obtained only through the study of the *Gyankand* of *Veda*. Compliance with the *Karmkand* does not lead outside the *Sansara*. But he who, assisted by the grace of the Lord, cognizes and meditates on him in the way prescribed by the *Upanishads* reaches at his death final emancipation, i.e. he passes through the different stages of the path of the Gods up to the world of Brahma and there enjoys an everlasting blissful existence from which there is no return into the sphere of transmigration. The characteristics of the released soul are similar to those of Brahma; it participates in all the latter's glorious qualities and powers, excepting only Brahma's power to emit, rule and retract the entire world.

5. The chief points in which the two systems agree on the one hand and diverge on the other are these: Both systems teach *Advaet* i.e. non-duality or monism. There exist not several fundamentally distinct principles, such as *Prakriti* and *Purush* of the *Sankhya*, but there exists only one all-embracing being. While, however, the *Advaet* taught by Shankara is a rigorous, absolute one, Ramanuja's doctrine has to be characterized as *Vishishtadvaesh* i.e. qualified non-duality, non-duality with a difference. According to Shankara, whatever is, is Brahma, and Brahma itself is absolutely homogeneous, so that all difference and plurality must be illusory. According to Ramanuja also, whatever is, is Brahma, but Brahma is not of homogeneous nature, but contains within itself elements of plurality, owing to which it truly manifests itself in a diversified world with its variety of material forms of existence and individual souls is not unreal *Maya* but a real part of Brahma's nature, the body investing the universal self. The Brahma of Shankara is in itself impersonal, a homogeneous mass of objectless thought, transcending all attributes; a personal God it becomes only through its association with the unreal principle of *Maya*, so that, strictly speaking, Shankara's personal God, his *Ishwar*, is himself something unreal. Ramanuja's Brahma, on the other hand, is essentially a personal God, the all-powerful and all wise ruler of a real world permeated and animated by his spirit. There is thus no room for the distinction between a *Pram Nirguna*ˑ And *Apram Saguna* Brahma, between Brahma and Ishwar. Shankara's individual soul is Brahma in so far as [it is] limited by the unreal *Upadhi* due to *Maya*. The individual soul of Ramanuja, on the other hand, is really individual soul of Ramanuja, on the other hand, is really individual; it has indeed sprung from Brahma and is never outside Brahma, but nevertheless it enjoys a separate personal

existence and will remain a personality for ever. The release from *Sansara* means according to Shankara the absolute merging of the individual soul in Brahma, due to the dismissal of the errouneous notion the soul is distinct from Brahma; according to Ramanuja it only means the soul's passing from the troubles of earthly life into a kind of paradise where it will remain for ever in undisturbed personal bliss. As Ramanuja does not distinguish a higher and lower Brahma the distinction of a higher and lower knowledge is likewise not valid for him; the teaching of the Upanishads is not two fold but essentially one, and leads the enlightened devotee to one result only.

6. As Shankara's views are mostly considered to be true, we will follow him in some details as to what he says in his comments on the *Vedanta* aphorisms. The whole work is divided into four parts, each part containing four parts, each part containing four chapters. We will deal with them in order.[1]

(a) In the first chapter he deals with certain passages from Upanishads referring to the word Brahma. We will consider only that part wherein the word Brahma is defined. Brahma is that from which the origin, subsistence and dissolution of this world proceed. Shankara explains this definition by saying that omniscient omnipotent cause from which proceed the origin, subsistence and dissolution of this world- which world is differentiated by names and forms, contains many agents and enjoyers, it the abode of the fruits of actions, these fruits having their definite places, times and causes, and the nature of whose arrangement cannot even be conceived by mind-that cause is Brahma.[2]

(b) *Vedanta* philosophy then rests on the fundamental conviction of the *Vedantistss* that the Soul and absolute Being or Brahma is one in their essence. In the old Upanishads this conviction rises slowly; but when once it was recognized that the Soul and Brahma were in their deepest essence one, the old mythological language of the Upanishads was given up; for instance the passage representing the soul as travelling on the road of the fathers *Pitryan* or the road of the Gods *Devyan*. We read in the *Vedanta* aphorisms that this approach to the throne of Brahma has its proper meaning so long only as Brahma is still considered personal and endowed with various qualities but that when the knowledge of the true, the absolute and unqualified Brahman, the Absolute Being, has once risen in the mind these mythological concepts have to vanish. " How would it be possible," Shankara says, " that he who is free from all attachment, unchangeable and unmoved, should approach another person, should move or go to another place? The highest oneness, if once truly conceived, excludes anything like an approach to a different object or to a distant place."

(c) The Sanskrit language has the great advantage that it can express the difference between the qualified and the unqualified Brahma by a mere change of gender; Brahma being used as a masculine when it is meant for the qualified and Brahma as a neuter when it is meant for the unqualified Brahma, the Absolute Being. This is a great help and there is nothing corresponding to it in English.

(d) We must remember also that the fundamental principle of the *Vedanta* philosophy was not 'Thou art He' but 'Thou art that' and that it was not 'thou will be' but 'thou art'. This 'thou art' expresses something, that is, that has been and always will be, not something that has still to be achieved, or is to follow, for instance, after death.

Thus Shankara says: "If it is said that the Soul will go to Brahma, that means that it will in future attain, or rather, that it will be in future what, though unconsciously, it always has been, viz. Brahma. For when we speak of some one going to some one else, it cannot be one and the same who is distinguished as the subject and the object. Also, if we speak of worship, that can only be if the worshipper is different from the worshipped. By true knowledge the individual soul does not become Brahma but is Brahma as soon as it knows what it really is and always has been. Being and knowing are one here."

(c) Here lies the characteristic difference between *Yoga* philosophy and *Vedanta*. In *Yoga* the human soul is represented as burning with love for God, as filled with a desire for union with or absorption in God. We find little of that in the Upanishads, and when such ideas occur they are argued away by the *Vedanta* philosophers. They always cling to the conviction that the Divine has never been really absent from the human soul, that it always is though covered by darkness or nescience, and that as soon as that darkness or that nescience is removed the soul is once more and in its own right what it always has been. It is- it does not become- Brahma.

(f) Last time I gave you the dialogue from the Chhandogya Upanishad between a young student Shwetaketu and his father. In that dialogue we have only a popular and not yet systematized view of the *Vedanta*. There are several passages indeed, which seem to speak of the union and absorption of the soul rather than of its recovery of its true nature. Such passages are always explained away by the stricter Vedanta philosophers and they have no great difficulty in doing this. For there remains always the explanation that the qualified personal Brahma in the masculine gender is meant and not yet the highest Brahma, which is, free from all qualities. That modified personal Brahma exists for all practical purposes, till its unreality has been discovered through the discovery of the highest Brahma; and as in one sense the modified masculine Brahma is the highest Brahma as soon as we know it and shares all its true reality with the highest Brahma as soon as we know it, many things may in a less strict sense be predicated of Him, the modified Brahma, which in truth apply to it only, the highest Brahma. This amphibole runs through the whole of the *Vedanta* Sutras and a considerable portion of the *sutras* is taken up with the task of showing that when the qualified Brahma seems to be meant it is really the unqualified Brahma that ought to be understood. Again, there are ever so many passages in the Upanishads which seem to refer to the individual soul but which, if properly explained, must be considered as referring to the highest *Atman* that gives support and reality to the individual soul. This at least is the view taken by Shankara, whereas the fact is that there have been different stages in the development of the belief in the highest Brahma and in the highest *Atman*; and some

passages in the Upanishads belong to earlier phases of Indian thought when Brahma was still conceived simply as the highest deity and true blessedness was supposed to consist in the gradual approach of the soul to the throne of God.

(g) The fundamental principle of Vedanta philosophy that in reality there exists and there can exist nothing but Brahma, that Brahma is everything, the material as well as the efficient cause of the universe, is of course in contradiction with our ordinary experience. In Indian as any where else, man imagines at first that he in his individual bodily and spiritual character is something that all objects of the outer world also exist as objects. Idealistic philosophy swept this distinction with the *Vedantists*s.

(h) The *Vedanta* philosopher however is not only confronted with this difficulty but he has to meet another difficulty peculiar to himself. The whole of the *Veda* is in his eyes infallible, yet that *Veda* enjoins the worship of many Gods and even in enjoining the worship *Upasana* of *Brahma*, the highest deity in his active masculine and personal character, it recognizes an objective deity different from the subject that is to offer worship and sacrifice to him.

Hence the *Vedanta* philosopher has to tolerate many things. He tolerates the worship of an objective Brahma as a preparation for the knowledge of the subjective and objective or the Absolute Brahma, which is the highest object of his philosophy. He admits one Brahma endowed with quality, but high above the usual Gods of the *Veda*. This Brahma is reached by the pious on the path of the Gods; he can be worshipped and it is he who rewards the pious for their good works. Still, even he is in that character the result of *Avidya (*ignorance, nescience), of the same ignorance which prevents the soul of man, the *Atman*, from distinguishing itself from its encumbrances, the so-called *Upadhis* such as body, the organs of sense and their works.

(i) This nescience can be removed by knowledge only and this knowledge is imparted by the *Vedanta* which shows that all our ordinary knowledge is simply the result of ignorance or nescience, is uncertain, deceitful and perishable or, as we should say, phenomenal, relative and conditioned. The true knowledge called *Smyagdarshan* or complete insight cannot be gained by sensuous perception *Prtyaksh* or by inference *Anuman*, nor can obedience to the law of the *Veda* produce more than temporary enlightenment or happiness. According to the orthodox Vedanta, *Shruti* alone or what is called revelation can impart that knowledge and remove that nescience which is innate in human nature.

(j) Of the higher Brahma nothing can be predicated but that it is and that through our nescience it appears to be this or that.

When a great *Vedantistss* was asked to describe Brahma, he was simply silent- that was his answer. But when it is said that Brahma is, that means at the same time that Brahma is not, that is to say, that Brahma is nothing of what is supposed to exist in our sensuous

perceptions.

There are two other qualities, which may safely be assigned to Brahma, namely, that it is intelligent and that it is blissful, or rather that it is intelligence and bliss. Intelligent seems the nearest approach to Sanskrit *Chit* and *Chaetanya*. Spiritual would not answer, because it would not express more than that it is not material. But *Chit* means that it is, that it perceives and knows, though as it can perceive itself only we may say that it is lighted up by its own light or knowledge, or, as it is sometimes expressed, that it is pure knowledge and pure light. We can best understand it when we consider what is negatived by it, namely, dullness, deafness, darkness and all that is material. In several passages a third quality is hinted at, namely blissfulness, but this again only seems another name for perfection and chiefly intended to exclude the idea of any possible suffering in Brahma.

It is in the nature of this Brahma to be always subjective and hence it is said that it cannot be known in the same way as all other objects are known, but only as a knower knows that he knows and he is.

(k) Still whatever is and whatever is known-two things which in the *Vedanta* and in all other idealistic systems of philosophy are identical-all is in the end Brahma. Though we do not know it, it is Brahma that is known to us when conceived as the author or creator of the world, an office, according to Hindu idea, quite unworthy of the Godhead in its true character. It is the same Brahma that is known to us in our own self-consciousness. Whatever we may seem to be or imagine ourselves to be for a time, we are in truth the eternal Brahma, the eternal self. With this conviction in the background, the *Vedantistss* retains his belief in what he calls the Lord, God, the creator and ruler of the world, but only as phenomenal or as adapted to the human understanding. He thinks that just as a man believes in his personal self so he is sure to believe in a personal God, and such personal God may even be worshipped. But we must remember that what is worshipped is only a person, or as the Brahmins call it a *Prteek*, an aspect of the true eternal essence as conceived by us in our inevitably human and limited knowledge. Thus the strictest observance of religion is insisted on while we are what we are. We are told that there is truth in the ordinary belief in God as the creator or cause of the world, but a relative truth only, relative to the human understanding, just as there is truth in the perception of our senses and in the belief in our personality, but relative truth only. His belief in the *Veda* would suffice to prevent the *Vedantistss* from a denial of the Gods or from what we call atheism.

In deference to the *Veda* the *Vedantistss* has even to admit, if not exactly a creation, at least a repeated emanation of the world from Brahma and re-absorption of it into Brahma from *Kelp* to *Kelp* or from age to age.

If we ask what led to a belief in the individual souls the answer we get is the Upadhi, the surroundings or the encumbrances, i.e. the body with the breath or life in it, the organs of

sense and the mind. These together form the subtle body *Sooksham Shreer* and this *Sooksham Shreer* is supposed to survive while death can destroy the coarse body *Sthool Shreer* only. The individual soul is held by this subtle body and its fates are determined by acts which are continuing in their consequences and which persist in their effects for ever, or at least until true knowledge has arisen and put an end even to the subtle body and to all phantasms of nescience.

(I) How the emanation of the world from Brahma is conceived in *Vedanta* philosophy is of small interest. It is almost purely mythological and indicates a very low knowledge of physical science. Brahma is not indeed represented any longer as a maker or a creator, as an architect or a potter. What we translate by creation *Srishti* means really no more than a letting out and corresponds closely with the theory of emanation. The Upanishads propose ever so many similes by which they wish to render the concept of creation or emanation more intelligible. One of the oldest similes applied to the production of the world from Brahma is that of the spider drawing forth, i.e. producing, the web of the world from itself. Another simile, which is meant to do away with what there is left of efficient- besides material-causality in the simile of the spider which after all sill the throwing out and drawing back of the threads of the world, is that of hair growing from the skull. Nor is the theory of what we call evolution wanting in the Upanishads. One of the most frequent similes used for this is the change of milk into curds. The curds are nothing but the milk only under a different form. It was soon found however that this simile violated the postulate that the One Being must not only be one but that, if perfect in itself, it must be unchangeable. Shankara therefore offered a new theory. It is distinguished by the name of *Vivart* from the *Pariṅam* or evolution theory, which is held by Ramanuja. *Vivart* of Shankara means turning away. It teaches that the Supreme Being remains always unchanged and that our believing that anything else can exist beside it arises from *Avidya* i.e. nescience. Most likely this *Avidya* or ignorance was first conceived as purely subjective, for it is illustrated by the ignorance of a man who mistakes a rope for a snake. In this case the rope remains all the time what it is, it is only our ignorance which frightens us and determines our actions. In the same way Brahma always remains the same, it is our ignorance only, which makes us see a phenomenal world and a phenomenal God. Another favorite simile is our mistaking mother-of-pearl for silver. The *Vedantist* says: We may take it for silver but it always remains mother-of-pearl. So we may speak of the snake and the rope, or of the silver and mother-of-pearl, as being one. And yet we do not mean that the rope has actually undergone a change or has turned into silver. After that the *Vedantists* argue that what the rope is to the snake the Supreme Being is to the world, They go on to explain that when they hold that the world is Brahma they do not mean that Brahma is actually transformed into the world, for Brahma cannot change and cannot be transformed. They mean that Brahma presents itself as the world or appears to be the world. The world's reality is not its own but Brahma's, yet Brahma is not the material cause of the world, as the spider is of the web, or the milk of the curds, or the sea of the foam, or the clay of the jar (which is made by the potter), but only the substratum, the illusory material cause. There would be no snake without the rope, there would be no

world without the Brahma, and yet the rope does not become a snake nor does Brahma become the world. With the *Vedantists* the phenomenal and the nominal are essentially the same. The silver as we perceive and call it is the same as the mother-of-pearl; without the mother-of-pearl there would be no silver for us. We impart to mother-of-pearl the name and form of silver, and by the same process by which we create silver the whole world was created by worlds and forms.

(m) Besides, the *Vedanta* philosophy has its own theory as to the creation of the whole world out of Brahma and *Avidya*. The purport of the philosophy however comes to this: All being is Brahma, nothing can be except Brahma, while all that exists is an illusory, not a real, modification of Brahma and is caused by name and form. When the true knowledge arises, everything becomes known as Brahma only. We may ask, whence the names and forms and whence the phantasmagoria of unreality. The *Vedantists* has but one answer, it is simply due to *Avidya*. There is another simile. Indian jugglers knew how to make people believe that they saw two or three jugglers while there was only one. The juggler himself remained one, knew himself to be one only-like Brahma; but to the spectators he appeared as many. But all these are similes only and with us there would remain the question whence this nescience. The *Vedantists* is satisfied with the conviction that for a time we are as a matter of fact nescient and what he cares for chiefly is to find out, not how that nescience arose but how it can be removed.

(n) What is the mode of removing this ignorance? *Bharati Tirtha*, a famous *Vedantist*, says: "Neglecting the unreal creation consisting of mere name and form, one should meditate on the Brahma and should ever practice internal as well as external concentration. Internal concentration is of two kinds, *Sviklp*, and *Nirviklp*. The first is the meditation of (on?) the subjective *Atma* as the witness of the mental world-passions, desires etc. arising in the mind. The second is the fixing one's mind on the thought `I am Brahma', [Brahma] which is described in the *Vedas* as self-existent, eternal, all-consciousness and pleasure, self-illumined and unique in itself. That is *Nirviklp* in which, through the ecstasy of the pleasure consequent upon the knowledge of one's self, the sight as well as the world are both overlooked and the mind stands like the jet of a lamp burning in place protected from the slightest breeze. The separation in any external object of sight, of name and form from its original substratum *Sat* is *Drishanuviddh* external concentration. The meditation on the one, unique and *Sachidanand* Brahma as the only reality in the universe is *Shabdanuvridh* external concentration. The third *nirvikalpa* is, like the one described before, cessation of all thought, from the enjoyment of one eternal pleasure. One should devote one's time to these six kinds of *Smadhi*.[3] The false identity of the material shell and the Universal Life being dissolved and the universal *Atman* being thoroughly realized, wherever the mind of the ascetic is directed there it naturally loses itself into one or other of these *Samadhi*. That limit of limits being seen, the knot of *Ahamkar* (egoism) is cut asunder, all doubts disappear, all actions cease to affect."[4]

REFERENCES:

1. Gandhi does not actually follow Shankara's Commentary chapter- wise though, of course, almost all the issues here taken up do occur in this Commentary

2. VS 1.2 and Shankara thereon.

3. To summarize, the six kinds of *Samadhi* are: (i) *Drishyanuvidh* internal, (ii) *Shabdanuvidh* internal, (iii) *Nirvikalp* internal, (iv) *Drishyanuvidh* external, (v) *Shabdanuvidh* external, (vi) *Nirviklp* external. As can be seen, (i), (ii), (iv) and (v) are *Sviklp Samadhi* - because (iii) and (vi) are alone *Nirviklp Samadhi*.

4. It will be located in some text of *Bharti Tirtha*. *Panchdashi*, of course, says:

Shakyam jaitun manorajyam nirvikalpsmadhina
Sunspad krmat soapi sviklpsmadhina

VI

BUDDHISM

1. We have described, very shortly though, those schools of philosophy who take *Vedas* as their guide. We are now entering upon another school-one of the two, which have discarded the *Veda*s and followed their own lines of thought. Buddhism is one of them. A philosophy is not born in a day and therefore to say that Buddha while sitting under the Bo tree was inspired as it were with the truths which he afterwards circulated has no meaning. Truths are not reached in a moment. Sciences and arts are not discovered in a day and therefore Buddha who was a Hindu by birth and a follower of the Brahma faith must have been the outcome of his time.

Six centuries before Christ, India witnessed the commencement of a great revolution. The Brahmanical religion had been practiced and proclaimed for centuries of years. The Gods of the Rig-*Veda* whom the ancient had invoked and worshipped lovingly and fervently had come to be regarded as so many names and *Indra* and *Usha* raised no distinct ideas and no grateful emotions. The simple libations of the *Som* juice, which the old *Rishi* had offered to their gods, had developed into cumbrous ceremonials, elaborate rites and utter sacred prayers for the people. The people were taught to believe that they earned merit by having these rites performed and prayers uttered by hired priests.

It was Buddha who created a reaction in such society.[1]

2. About 100 miles northeast of the city of Benares was situated about 600 years before Christ a place called Kpilavastu on the bank of the River Rohini. And two kindred clans - the Shakyas and Kolians-lived on the opposite banks of that river. Kapilavastu was the capital of the Shakyas who were then living in peace with the Kolians and Shuddhodana the king of Shakyas had married two daughters of the king of Kolians. Neither queen bore any child of Shuddodana for many years, and the hope of leaving an heir to the principality of the Shakyas was well nigh abandoned. At last however the elder queen promised her husband an heir and according to ancient custom left for he father's house in order to be confined. But before she reached the place she gave birth to a son in the pleasant grove of *Lumbini*. The mother and child were carried back to Kapilavastu where the mother died 7 days after leaving the child to be nursed by his stepmother and maternal aunt, the younger queen.

The birth of Gautama is naturally the subject of many legends, which have most remarkable resemblance with the legends about the birth of Jesus Christ. The boy was named Siddhartha but Gautama was his family name. He belonged to the Shakya tribe and is therefore called *Shakyasingh*; and when he had proclaimed and preached a reformed religion he was called Buddha or the awakened or enlightened.

Little is known of the early life of young Gautama except that he was married to his cousin Yashodhara, daughter of the king of Koli about the age of 18. It is said that Gautama neglected the manly exercises which all Kshatryas of his age delighted in, and that his relations complained of that. A day was accordingly fixed for the trial of his skill and the young prince of the Shakyas proved his superiority to his kinsmen.

Ten years after his marriage Gautama resolved to quit his home and his wife for the study of philosophy and religion. The story which is told of the young prince abandoning his home and his position is well known. He must have for a long time pondered deeply and sorrowfully on the sins and sufferings of humanity, he must have been struck with the vanity of wealth and position. It is said that the sight of decrepit old man, of a sick man, of decaying corpse and of dignified hermit led him to form his resolution to quit home.

At this time a son was born to him. It is said that the news was announced to him in a garden on the riverside and the pensive young man only exclaimed: This is a new and strong tie I shall have to break." That night he repaired to the threshold of his wife's chamber - and there by the light of the flickering lamp, he gazed on a scene of perfect bliss. His young wife lay surrounded by flowers and with one hand on the infant's head. A yearning arose in his heart to take the babe in his arms for the last time before relinquishing all earthly bliss. But this he might not do. The mother might be awakened and the importunities of the fond and loving soul might unnerve his heart and shake his resolution. Silently then he tore himself away from that place. In that one eventful moment, in the

silent darkness of that night he renounced for ever his princely fame and more than all this the affection of happy home, the love of a young wife and of a tender infant now lying unconscious in sleep. He renounced all this and rode away that night to become a poor student and homeless wanderer. His faithful servant Channa asked to be allowed to stay with him and become an ascetic but Gautama sent him back and repaired alone to Rajhagriha.

Rajgrha was the capital of Bimbisara, the king of Magdhas and was situated in a valley surrounded by five hills. Some Brahmin ascetics lived in the caves of this hill sufficiently far from the town for studies and contemplation and yet sufficiently near to obtain supplies. Gautama attached himself first to one Alara and then to another Udraka and learned from them all that Hindu philosophy had to teach.

Not satisfied with this learning Gautama wished to see if penances could bring superhuman insight and power as they were reputed to do. He retired therefore to the jungle of Uruvela near the site of the present temple of Buddha Gaya and for six year attended by five disciples he gave himself up to the severest penance and self-mortification, but he could not obtain what he sought. At last one day he fell down from sheer weakness and his disciples thought he was dead. But he recovered and despairing of deriving any profit from penance he abandoned it. His disciples who did not understand his object lost all respect for him when he gave up his penances. They left him alone and went away to Banaras.

Left alone in the world, Gautama wandered towards the banks of Niranjara, received his morning meal from the hands of Sujata, a village daughter, and set himself down under the Bo-tree or the tree of wisdom. For a long time he sat in contemplation and scenes of his past life came thronging into his mind. The learning he had acquired had produced no results the penances he had undergone were vain, his disciples had left him alone in the world. Would he now return to his loving widowed wife, to his little child now a sweet boy of six years, to his affectionate father and his loyal people? This was possible, but where would be the satisfaction? What would become of the mission to which he had devoted himself? Long he sat in contemplation and doubt, until the doubts cleared away like mists in the morning and the daylight. Truth flashed before his eyes. What was this truth which learning did not touch and penances did not impart? He made no new discovery, he had acquired no new knowledge, but his pious nature and his benevolent heart told him that a holy calm life and love towards others were panacea for all evils. Self-culture and universal love- this was his discovery, this is the essence of Buddhism.

The conflict in Gautam's mind, which thus subsided in calm, is described in Buddhist writings by marvelous incidents. Clouds and darkness prevailed the earth and oceans quaked, rivers flowed back to their sources and peaks of lofty mountains rolled down.

Gautam's old teacher Alara was dead and he therefore went to Benaras to proclaim the truth to his five former disciples. On the way he met a man of the name of Upaka

belonging to the Ajivaka sect of ascetics who, looking at the composed and happy expression on Gautam's face asked: " Your countenance, friend, is serene, your complexion is pure and bright. In whose name, friend, have you retired from the world? Who is your teacher and what doctrine do you profess?" To this Gautama replied that he had no teacher, that he had obtained *Nirvana* by the extinction of all passions and added: I go to the city of Kashi to beat the drum of the immortal in the darkness of the world." Upaka did not understand him and replied after a little conversation, "It may be so, friend," shook his head and took another road and went away.

At Benaras, Gautama entered the Deer Park *Migdav* in the cool of the evening and met his former disciples. And he explained to them his new tenets:

"There are two extremes, O Bhikkhus, which the man who has given up the world ought not to follow the habitual practice, on the one hand, of those things whose attraction depends upon the passion, and especially of sensuality, a low and pagan way, unprofitable and fit only for the worldly-minded, and the habitual practice, on the other hand, of asceticism which is painful, unworthy and unprofitable. There is a middle path, O Bhikkhus, avoiding these two extremes, discovered by the Tathagat Buddha, a path which opens the eyes and bestows understanding, which leads to peace of mind, to the higher wisdom, to full enlightenment, to *Nirvana*."

And he explained to them the four truths concerning suffering, the cause of suffering, the destruction of suffering, and the way, which leads to the destruction of suffering. And the way was described to be eight folds. "This doctrine", Gautama said, "was not, O Bhikkhus, among the doctrines handed down. In Benaras in the hermitage of *Migdav*, the supreme wheel of the Empire of truth has been set rolling by the Blessed One-that wheel which not by any *Saman* or *Brahman*, not by any God, not by any *Brahma* or *Mar*, not by any one in the universe can ever be turned back."

The five former disciples of course were soon converted and were the first members of the order. Yasa, the son of the rich banker of Benares was his first lay disciple and the story of the conversion of this young man, nurtured in the lap of luxury and wealth, is worth repeating. He had three palaces, one of winter, one for summer, one for rainy season. One night he woke from sleep and found the female musicians still sleeping in the room with their dress and musical instruments in disorder. He became disgusted with what he saw and in moment of deep thoughtfulness said, "Alas, what distress, Alas ! What danger." And he left the house and went out. It was dawn and Gautama was walking up and down in open air and heard the perplexed and sorrowful young man exclaiming these worlds. He replied, "Here is no distress, Yasa. Here is no danger. Come here, Yasa. Sit down. I will teach you the truth." And Yasa heard the truth from the saintly teacher and became converted. Yasa's father, mother and wife all went to Gautama and listened to the holy truth. Yasa became a personal follower of Gautama, the other three remained his disciples.

Within 5 months of his arrival at Benares, Gautama had sixty followers. And now he called them together and dismissed them in different directions to preach the truth for the salvation of mankind. "Go you now, O Bhikkhus, and wander for the gain of the many, for the welfare of Gods and men. Let not two of you go the same way. Preach, O Bikkhus, the doctrine which is glorious in the end, in the spirit and in the letter; proclaim a consummate, perfect and pure life of holiness."

At Uruvela, Gautama converted three brothers named Kashyapa who worshipped fire in the Vedic form and had high reputation as hermits and philosophers. The eldest brother Uruvela Kashyapa and his pupils first flung their hair, their braids, their provisions and the things for *Agnihotr* sacrifice into the river and received the *Pavja* and *Upsanpada* ordination from the Blessed one. His brothers, who lived by the river Niranjara and at Gaya, soon followed the example. The conversions of the Kashyapa created a sensation and Gautama with his new disciples and 1000 followers walked towards Rajgrha, the capital of Magadha. News of the new prophet soon reached the king and *Saiṅiya* Bimbisara surrounded by numbers of *Brahman* and *Vaeshya* went to visit Gautama. Seeing the distinguished Uruvela Kashyapa there, the king could not make out if that great Brahmin had converted Gautama or if Gautama had converted the Brahmin. Gautama understood king's perplexity and in order to enlighten him asked Kashyapa, "What knowledge have you gained, O inhabitant of Uruvela, that has induced you who were renowned for your penances, to forsake your sacred fire?" Kashyapa replied that he had seen the state of peace and took no more delight in sacrifices and offerings. The king was struck and pleased and with his numerous attendants declared himself an adherent of Gautama, and invited him to take his meal with him the next day.

The solitary wanderer accordingly went, an honored guest, to the palace, of the king, and the entire population of the capital of *Magadha* turned out to see him. The king then assigned a *Bamboo* grove *Vaiṅuvan* close by for the residence of Gautama and his followers, and there, Gautama rested for some time. Shortly after Gautama obtained two renowned converts, Sariputta and Magellan.

The fame of Gautama had now traveled to his native town and his old father expressed a desire to see him once before he died. Gautama accordingly went to Kapilavastu, but according to custom remained in the grove outside the town. His father and relatives came to see him there. And the next day Gautama himself went into the town begging alms from the people who once adored him as their beloved prince and master. The story goes on to say that the king rebuked Gautama for this act, but Gautama replied it was the custom of his race. "But", retorted the king, "We are descended from an illustrious race of warriors and not one of them has ever begged his bread." "You and your family," answered Gautama, "may claim descent from kings; my descent is from the prophet, Buddha of the old."

The kings took his son to the palace where all the members of the family came to greet

him except his wife. The deserted Yashodhara with a wife's grief and a wife's pride exclaimed, "If I am of any value in his eyes he will himself come; I can welcome him better here." Gautama understood this and went to her with only two disciples with him. And when Yashodhara saw her lord and prince enter a recluse with shaven head and yellow robes- her heart failed her; she flung herself to the ground, held his feet and burst into tears. Then remembering the impossible gulf between them, she rose and stood aside; she listened to his new doctrine and when subsequently Gautama was induced to establish an order of female mendicants Yashodhara became one of the first Buddhist nuns. Just at this time however she remained in her house but Rahula, Gautam's son, was converted. Gautam's father was aggrieved at this and asked Gautama to establish a rule that no one should in future be admitted to the order without his parents' consent. Gautama consented to this and made a rule accordingly.

On his way back to Rajgrha, Gautama stopped for some time at Anupiya, a town belonging to the Mallas. And while he was stopping there he made many converts both from the Kolian and from the Shakya tribe, some of whom deserve special mention. Aniruddh, the Shakya, went to his mother and asked to be allowed to go into the houseless state. His mother did not know how to stop him and so told him, "If Bhaddiya, the Shakya, will renounce the world thou also mayest go forth into the houseless state." Aniruddha accordingly went to Bhaddiya and it was decided that they should embrace the order in seven days. Chulvagga, the Buddhist Sutra says: So Bhaddiya, the Shakyaraj, and Aniruddha, and Ananda and Bhagu and Kimball and Devadatt just as they had so often previously gone out to the pleasure ground with fourfold array, and Upali the barber went with them, making seven in all. And when they had gone some distance, they sent their retinue back and crossed over to the neighboring district and took off their fine things and wrapped them in their robe and made a bundle of them and said to Upali the barber; " Do you now, Upali, turn back. These things will be sufficient for you to live upon." But Upali was of a different mind so all the seven went to Gautama and became converts. And when Bhaddiya had retired into solitude, he exclaimed over and over, " O happiness! O happiness!" And on being asked the cause said: "Formerly, Lord when I was a king I had a guard, completely provided, both within and without my private apartments, both within and without and town and within the borders of my country. Yet though I was thus guarded and protected I was fearful, anxious, distrustful and alarmed. But bow, Lord, even in the forest at the foot of a tree in solitude I am without fear or anxiety, trustful and not alarmed; I dwell at ease, subdued, secure, with mind as peaceful as an antelope."

Of these converts Ananda became the most intimate friend and companion of Gautama and after his death led the band of 500 monks in chanting the *Dharma* in the council of Rajagrha. Upali, though barber by birth, became an eminent member of the order and his name is often mentioned in connection with the *Vinyapitak*. Devadatta became subsequently the rival and opponent of Gautama and is even said to have advised Ajatashatru, the prince of Magadha, to kill his father Bimbisara and then attempted to kill Gautama himself.

After spending his second *Vas* or rainy season in Rajagrha Gautama repaired to *Sravasti*, the capital of Kosalas, where Prasenajit reigned as king. A wood called *Jaitvan* was presented to the Buddhists and Gautama often repaired and preached there. Gautam 's instructions were always delivered orally and preserved in the memory of the people like all the ancient books of India, although writing was known at this time.

The third *Vas* was also passed in Rajagrha and in the fourth year from the date of proclaiming is creed Gautama crossed the Ganges, went to Vaisali and stopped in the Mahavana grove. Thence he is said to have made a miraculous journey through the air to settle a dispute between the Shakyas and Kolians about the water of the Boundary River Rohini. In the following year he again repaired to Kapilvastu and was present at the death of his father, then 97 years old.

His widowed step-mother Prajapati Gautami and his no less widowed wife Yashodhara had now no ties to bind then to the world and insisted on joining the order established by Gautama. The sage had not yet admitted women to the order and was naturally most reluctant to do so. But his mother was inexorable and followed him to Vaisali and begged to be admitted. Ananda pleaded her case but Gautama still replied: " Enough, Ananda, Let it not please thee that women should be allowed to do so." But Ananda persisted and asked, "Are women, Lord, capable when they have gone forth form the household life and entered the homeless state under the doctrine and discipline proclaimed by the blessed one, are they capable of realizing the fruit of conversion, or of the second path or of *Arhat* ship?"[2] There could be only one reply to this Honor to women has ever been a part of religion in India and salvation and heaven are not barred to the female sex by the Hindu religion. "They are capable," reluctantly replied Gautama.

And Prajapati and other ladies were admitted to the order as *Bhikkhunee* under some rules making them strictly subordinate to *Bhikkhu*. After this Gautama retired to Kausambi near Prayag (Allahabad).

In the sixth year after spending the rains at Kausambi Gautama returned to Rajagrha, and Kshema the queen of Bimbisara was admitted to the order. In same year Gautama is said to have performed miracles at Sravasti and went to heaven to teach *Dharma* to his mother who had died 7 days after his birth.

In the eleventh year Gautama converted the Brahmin Bharadvaja. In the next year he undertook the longest journey he had ever made and then preached the famous Mharahulsutan to his son Rahula, then 18 years old. Two years later Rahula was admitted in the order. In the fifteenth year he visited Kapilavastu again and addressed a discourse to his cousin Mahanama, who had succeeded Bhaddiya, the successor of Shuddhodana. Gautam's father-in-law Suprabuddha, the king of Koli, publicly abused Gautama for deserting Yashodhara but is said to have been swallowed up by the earth shortly after.

In the seventeenth year he delivered discourse on the death of Shrimati, a courtesan; in the next year he converted a weaver who had accidentally killed his daughter; in the following year he released a deer caught in a snare and converted the angry hunter who had wanted to shoot him; and in the twentieth year he similarly converted the famous robber Angulimala of the Chaliya forest.

For twenty-five years more Gautama wandered through the Gangetic valley, preached piety and holy life to the poor, the lowly and misguided, made converts among the high and the low, the rich and the poor and proclaimed his law wherever he went. He died at the age of 80. He lived 45 years from the date of his proclaiming the new religion.

3. This evening we proceed with the literature and philosophy of Buddhism:

(a) The form of Buddhism prevailing in Nepal, Tibet, China and Japan is called northern Buddhism, while the form prevailing in Ceylon and Burma is called Southern Buddhism. The Northern Buddhists furnished us with scanty material directly illustrating the religion in its earliest form in India. The sacred books of the Northern Buddhists are not included in any comprehensive common name and as far as is known none of then can be referred to the period immediately following on Gautam 's death. Kanishka, The king of Kashmir, convened a great. Kanishka, the king of Kashmir, convened a great council of the northern Buddhists in the first century after Christ, but the council instead of collecting together the sacred books of the Northern Buddhists wrote three great commentaries.[3] The Lalitavistata, a most important work of the Northern Buddhists, is only a gorgeous poem; it is no more a biography of Gautama than the Paradise Lost a biography of Jesus. It was composed probably in Nepal in the second, third or fourth century, and the works on Buddhism which were then carried by Chinese pilgrims from India from century to century and translated into the Chinese language do not illustrate the earliest phase of Buddhism in India. And lastly, Tibet his drifted still further away from primitive Buddhism in India and has adopted forms and ceremonies, which were unknown to Gautama and his followers in the sixth century before Christ.

(b) On the other hand, the southern Buddhists furnish us with the most valuable materials. The sacred books of the Southern Buddhists are known by the inclusive name of the three *Pitakas* and there is evidence to show that these *Pitakas* now extant in Ceylon are substantially identical with the canon as settled in the council of Patna about 242 B.C.

(c) The three Pitakas are known as the *Suttee Pitakas*, the *Vinaya Pitakas* and the *Abhidhamma Pitakas*. The works comprised in the *suttee Pitakas* profess to record the sayings and doings of Gautama Buddha himself. Gautama himself is the actor and the speaker in the earliest worker of this *Pitakas* and his doctrines are conveyed in his own words. Occasionally one of his disciples is the instructor and there are short introductions to indicate where or when Gautama or his disciple spoke. But all through the *Suttee Pitakas Gautam's* doctrines and moral precepts are preserved professedly, in Gautam's

own words.

The *Vinaya Pitakas* contains very minute rules for the conduct of monks and nuns who had embraced the holy order. Gautama respected the lay disciple *Upasak* but he held that to embrace the order was a quicker path to salvation. As the number of monks and nuns multiplied it was necessary to fix elaborate rules for their proper conduct and behaviour in the *Vihar* or monastery. As Gautama lived for nearly half a century after he had proclaimed his religion, there can be no doubt that he himself settled many of these rules.

The *Abhidhamma Pitakas* contains disquisition, on various subjects, like the conditions of life in different worlds, on the explanation of personal qualities, on the elements, the causes of existence etc. They have been miscalled metaphysics for early Buddhism knew little of metaphysics.[4]

(d -e) Last time I said that the doctrine of four noble truths is the central point of Buddhist teaching. The substance of the teaching is, that life is suffering, the thirst for life and its pleasures is the cause of suffering the extinction or the thirst for life and its pleasure is the cause of suffering, the extinction of the thirst is the cessation of suffering, and that such extinction can be brought about by a holy life. We will discuss these four truths one after another.

(d) The first truth is the truth of suffering. As Gautama said: " Birth is suffering, decay is suffering, illness is suffering, death is suffering. Presence of objects we hate is suffering, not to obtain [objects] we desire is suffering. Briefly, the fivefold clinging to existence, i.e. clinging to the five aggregates, is suffering." What are those five aggregates? In Buddhist philosophy man is a compound of five aggregates. These are *Roop* or the material aggregates- The first of the five. They include the four elements, earth, water, fire and air, five organs of sense, eye, ear, nose, tongue and body, five attributes of matter, form, sound, smell, taste and touch, two distinctions of sex, male and female, three essential condition, thought, vitality and space, two means of communication, gesture and speech, seven qualities of living bodies, buoyancy, elasticity, power of adaptation, power of aggregation, duration, decay chage.[5] The second class of aggregates is *Vaidna* or sensations- the sensation of pleasure or pain. The third is *Sangya* or name. The fourth is *Sanskar* or the potentialities, which lead to good or bad results, and the fifth is *Vigyan* or knowledge. These five aggregates include all bodily and mental parts and powers of man and neither any one of them nor any group of them is permanent. It is repeatedly laid down in the *Pitakas* that none of these *skandhas* is soul. The body itself is constantly changing and so also each of the other aggregates. Man is never the same for two consecutive moments and there is within him no abiding principle whatever.

In *Sanyut Nikkei*, a Buddhist work, Buddha says: " mendicants, in whatever way the different teachers regard the soul, they think it is the five *skandhas* or one of the five. Thus mendicants, the unlearned, unconverted man who does not associate either with the

converted or with the holy or understand their law or live according to it, such a man regards the soul either as identical with or as possessing or as containing or as residing in the material properties or sensations or in the other three *skandhas*. By regarding soul in one of these ways he gets the idea `I am'. Then there are the five organs of sense and mind and qualities and ignorance. From sensation produced by contact and ignorance the sensual, unlearned man derives the notions `I am' `This I exists', `I shall be' `I shall not be' etc. But now, mendicant, the learned disciple of the converted, having the same five organs of sense, has got rid of ignorance and acquired wisdom, and therefore the ideas `I am' etc. do not occur to him." This belief in self or soul is regarded in Buddhism so distinctly as a heresy those two well-known words in Buddhist terminology have been coined on purpose to stigmatize it. The first of these is *skayedithi*- the heresy of individuality- one of the three primary delicious which mush be abandoned at the very first stage of the Buddhist path of freedom. The other is *Atvad*, the doctrine of soul or self; it is classed with sensuality, heresy and belief in the efficacy of rites- as one of the four *upadans*[6], which are the immediate cause of birth, death, sorrow, lamentation, pain, grief and despair.

There is another Buddhist work called *Brahmjalsut,* in which Gautama discusses 62 different kinds of wrong belief; among them are those held by men who believe that the soul and the world are eternal, that there is no newly existing substance but these remain as a mountain peak unshaken, immovable, that living beings pass away, they transmigrate, they die and are born but these continue as being eternal. With regard to these Gautama says: " Upon what principle do these mendicants and Brahmins hold and doctrine of future existence? They teach that the soul is material or immaterial or is both or neither, that it is finite, or infinite or is both or neither, that it will have one or many modes or consciousness, that its perceptions will be few or boundless, that it will be in a state of joy, or of misery, or of both or of neither. These are the sixteen heresies teaching a conscious existence after death. Then there are eight heresies teaching that the soul material or immaterial or both or neither, finite or infinite or both or neither has an unconscious existence after death. And finally eight others which teach that the soul in the same eight ways exists after death in a state of being neither conscious nor unconscious." Lastly, he says: " Mendicants, that which binds the teacher to existence, *Tnha* or thirst, is cut off but his body still remains. While his body shall remain he will be seen by Gods and men, but after the termination of life, upon the dissolution of the body neither gods nor men will see him."

(e) So the first noble truth of Buddhism is that clinging to existence is misery. The second noble truth is the cause of misery. In Gautam's' words, "Thirst leads to rebirth accompanied by pleasure and lust- thirst for pleasure, thirst for existence, thirst for prosperity", And the third noble truth is, the cessation of suffering. It ceases with the complete cessation of thirst- a cessation, which consists in the absence of every passion - with the complete destruction of desire. The fourth truth is the noble truth of path, which leads to cessation of suffering. The holy eight-fold path is right belief, right meditation.

The substance of the teaching is that without entering into any discussion into the origin and destiny of men one should lead a holy moral life and that will lead him to the summum bonum.

(f) On the eve of his death Gautama called together his brethren and appears to have recapitulated the entire system of morality under seven heads and these are known as the seven jewels of the Buddhist Law.

"Which then, O Brethren, are the truths which, when I had perceived, I made known to you, which, when you have mastered, it behooves you to practice meditate upon and spread, in order that pure religion may last long and be perpetuated, in order that it may continue to be for the good and happiness of the great multitudes, out of pity for the world, to the good and the gain and the weal of Gods and men? They are these:

1. The four earnest meditations.
2. The fourfold great struggle against sin.
3. The four roads to saint-ship.
4. The five moral powers.
5. The five organs of spiritual sense.
6. The seven kinds of wisdom.
7. The noble eight-fold path."

The four earnest meditations alluded to are: meditations on the body, the sensations, the ideas and the reason. The fourfold struggle against sin is the struggle to prevent sinfulness, the struggle to increase goodness. The fourfold struggle comprehends in fact a life-long, earnest, unceasing endeavor on the part of man towards more and more of goodness and virtue. The fourfold roads to saint-ship are the four means the will, the exertion, the preparation, and the investigation by which *Idhi* is acquired. In later Buddhism *Idhi* means occult powers but what Gautama meant was probably the influence and power which the mind, by long training and exercise, can acquire over body. The five moral powers and five organs of spiritual sense are faith, energy, thought, contemplation, investigation, joy, repose, and serenity. The eight-fold path we have referred to.[7]

(g) It is by such prolonged self-culture, by the breaking of ten fetters doubt, sensuality etc.[8] that one can at last obtain *Nirvana*.

Dhammapada says: "There is no suffering for him who has finished his journey and abandoned grief who has freed himself on all sides and thrown off all fetters. They depart with their thoughts well collected they are not happy within abode. Like swans those have left their lake, they leave their house and home. Tranquil is his thought, tranquil are his words and deeds, who has been freed by true knowledge, who has become a tranquil man."

It was generally believed that *Nirvana* meant final extinction and death, and Prof. Max Muller was the first to point out, which most scholars have now accepted [viz.] that *Nirvana* does not mean death but only the extinction of the sinful condition of mind, that thirst for life and its pleasure which brings on new births. *Nirvana* was not applied to any state after death, it was a term applied to a certain state of the life here. What Gautama meant by *Nirvana* is something attainable in this life, it is the sinless calm state of mind, the freedom from desires and passions, the perfect peace, goodness and wisdom which continuous self-culture can procure for man. As Rhys Davids puts it, "The Buddhist Heaven is not death and it is not on death but it is on a virtuous life here and now that the Pitakas lavish those terms of ecstatic description which they apply to Arhat-ship as the goal of the excellent way and to Nirvana as one aspect of it."

(h) But is there no future bliss, no future heaven beyond the virtuous life here and now for those who have attained *Nirvana*? This was a question, which often puzzled Buddhists and they often pressed their great master for a categorical answer. Gautama was an agnostic and to all questions about a future life after the attainment of *Nirvana* his reply was: "I do not know. It is not given me to know."

Malunkyaputta pressed this question on Gautama and desired to know definitively if the perfect Buddha did or did not live beyond the death. Gautama inquired, "Have I said `come Malunkyaputta and be my disciple, I shall teach thee whether the world is everlasting or not everlasting?" "That thou last not said, sire", replied Malunkyaputta. "Then", said Gautama, "do not press the inquiry."

Once king Prasenajit of Koshala during a journey between his two chief towns' Saketa and Shravasti met the nun *Khema* renowned for her wisdom. The king paid his respect to her and said, " *Venderable* lady, does and perfect one exist after death?" She replied, "The Exalted one, O great king, has not declared that the perfect one exists after death." "Then does the perfect on not exist after death, Venerable lady?" inquired the king. But Khema still replied, " This also, O great King, the Exalted one has not declared that the perfect one does not exist after death."

This shows that Gautam's religion was a perfect agnosticism, which did not and could not look beyond *Nirvana*. We know that according to Gautam's theory there is nothing permanent in man, that every particle mental, spiritual or physical, perishes every moment and new aggregates come into existence by reason of the influence left by the *karma* or action of the former aggregates. Everything is momentary, and if a man leads a perfectly holy life he would not collect new karma which will lead him into new birth; and therefore the aggregates of which he is composed come to an end without the new aggregates coming into existence. So although Gautama might not have said in so many words that the future state after *Nirvana* is a state of annihilation, still the natural conclusion is that the state must be that of total annihilation. In an article in the Lucifer of march 1874, Mr. G. R. Meads tries to save Buddhism from the charge of propounding a theory of

annihilation and quotes a passage by Col. Olcott sanctioned by the High Priest of Ceylon. He says that although soul according to Buddhism is impermanent and changeable, still there is in man the permanent part called spirit. He says, "Buddhism does not deny the impressible nature of an ultimate spiritual reality in man, of a true transcendental subject, of an immortal changeless self." Now this self or transcendental subject has been know in all Indian philosophy by the name of *Atma*. With reference to Brahma Gautama has distinctly said in Tevijjia Sutta that the talk of the Brahmins about that Brahma is foolish talk and that there existed no such state as Brahma with reference to Brahma, I have already quoted Gautama as saying that it is heresy to say that there is any such thing as Brahma Soul and spirit; Atma and Brahama are all identical in Indian philosophies and an attempt to put into the mouth of Gautama views which he never maintained is fruitless attempt.

(i) If a man does not attain, while he is living, the state of *Nirvana* he is liable to future birth. Gautama did not believe in the existence of the soul, but nevertheless the theory of transmigration of souls was too deeply implanted in the Hindu mind to be eradicated and Gautama therefore adhered to the theory of transmigration without accepting the theory of soul! But if there is no soul, what is it that undergoes transmigration? The reply is given in the Buddhist doctrine of *karma*, which in its result corresponds to the Jaina and Hindu doctrines of *Karma* but in its foundation is entirely different from them. The doctrine is that *karma* or the doing of a man cannot die but must necessarily lead to its legitimate result. And when a sentient being dies a new being is produced according to the *karma* of the being that is dead. The cause which produces the new being is *Trishna* (thirst) or *upadan* (grasping). Sensation originates in the contact of the organs of sense with the exterior world; from sensations springs a desire to satisfy a felt want, a yearning, a thirst. From thirst results a grasping after objects to satisfy that desire, that grasping stage of mind causes a new being not, of course, a new soul, but a new set of *skandh*, a new body with mental tendencies and capabilities). The *karma* of the previous set of *skandh* or sentient being then determines the locality, nature and future of the new set of *skandh* or the new sentient being. Gautama said that in his philosophy four things are incomprehensible. The first is the effects of *karma*. And from what I have said just it is plain that the doctrine of *karma* as propounded by Gautama is an incomprehensible mystery.

(j) But the theory of transmigration was not the only theory, which Gautama accepted from the ancient religion and adopted, in a modified form into his own religion. The whole of the Hindu pantheon of the day was similarly accepted and similarly modified to suit his cardinal idea, the supreme efficacy of a holy life. The innumerable Gods of Rig-*Veda* were recognized but they were not supreme. Brahma, the supreme deity of the Upanishads, was recognized but was not supreme. Holy life alone was supreme and in preaching that doctrine. Buddha did an immense good; he raised goodness attainable by man above the gods and nature powers of Brahmins.

(k) How did Gautama deal with the caste system of the Brahmins? He respected a *Brahman* or *Shramana*, but he respected him for his virtue and learning, not for his caste which he altogether ignored. When two Brahmin youths, Vasishtha and Bharadwaja, began

(j) But the theory of transmigration was not the only theory, which Gautam accepted from the ancient religion and adopted, in a modified form into his own religion. The whole of the Hindu pantheon of the day was similarly accepted and similarly modified to suit his cardinal idea, the supreme efficacy of holy life. The innumerable gods of Rig-*Veda* were recognized but they were not supreme. Brahma, the supreme deity of the Upanishads, was recognized but was not supreme. Holy life alone was supreme and in preaching that doctrine Buddha did an immense good; he raised goodness attainable by man above the Gods and nature-powers of Brahmins.

(k) How did Gautama deal with the caste system of the Brahmins? He respected a Brahman, Sherman or Arhat, but he respected him for his virtue and learning, not for his caste, which he altogether ignored. When two Brahmin youths, Vasishtha and Bharadwaja, began to quarrel on the question "How does one become a Brahmin?" and came to Gautama for his virtue and learning, not for his caste which he altogether ignored. When two Brahmin youths, Vasishtha and Bharadwaja, began to quarrel on the question "How does one become a Brahmin?" and came to Gautama for his opinion Gautama delivered to them a discourse in which he emphatically ignored caste and held that a man's distinguishing mark was his work, not his birth.

(I) Gautama not only expressed his pronounced disapprobation against the Hindu case system he also exclaimed against the Vedic rites, which were practiced according to the injections of the ceremonial works. In place of such rites he enjoined a benevolent life and conquest of all passions and desires, and he recommended a retirement from the world as the most efficacious means for securing this end. The recommendation was followed and led to the Buddhist monastic system.

(m) And lastly, although Gautama himself disapproved of philosophical discussion, a system of Buddhist philosophy soon arose on the lines laid down by him; it ignored the existence of soul and maintained living creatures to be only assemblages of *skandhas* or aggregates; it knew of no state of future existence for those who attained *Nirvana*.

(n) What was it then that the Buddhists worshipped? What was the concrete form which Gautam's religion took in its early career before vast monasteries and an unwieldy priesthood replaced the primitive faith? What was the actual form of worship, which drew and engaged the multitude, which could not all have practiced or worshipped the abstract idea of a holy life? The reply is simple. For centuries, the people worshipped holiness and virtue as typified in the life of Gautama. They revered the memories of the great Teacher, they worshipped his invisible presence. The sculptures at Sanchi, at Amaravati, Barhut and

other places represent homage paid to tree, to serpent, to the wheel or to the umbrella, but in every case the object represents the presence of Buddha.

(o) The moral precepts of Buddha are so well known that we shall pass over them and go at once to the history of Buddhism after Gautam's death. According to the Pali Scriptures, Buddha's death took place in 543 B.C. but the European scholars put it in 477 B.C. We are told in Chullavagga that on the death of Gautama, the venerable Maha Kashyapa proposed, "Let us chant the Dhamma and *Vinaya*" The proposal was accepted and 499 *Arhat* were selected for the purpose and Ananda, the faithful friend and follower of Gautama, completed the number 500. And so they went up to Rajagrha to chant together the Dhamma and Vinaya. Upali, who was barber before, was questioned as the great authority on Vinaya and Ananda, the friend of Gautama, was questioned as the authority on Dhamma. This was the Council of Rajagrha held in the year of Gautam's death to settle the sacred text and fix it on the memory by chanting it together.

A century after the death of Gautama, a second council of 700 was held at Vaisali to settle disputes between the more and the less strict followers of Buddhism. It condemned a system of ten indulgences, which had grown up, but it led to the separation of the Buddhists into two hostile parties who afterwards split into 18 sects. During the next 200 years Buddhism spread over northern India. About 257 B.C. Ashoka, the king of Magadha, became a zealous convert to this faith. He founded many religious houses and his kingdom is called the land of monasteries.

REFERENCES:

1. The earlier draft of the lecture here says: "The biography of Buddha is so well known that it is not at al necessary to refer to it." But Gandhi seems to have changed his mind afterwards. Hence the immediately forthcoming narration of Buddha's life-story.

2. What are meant here are three increasingly advanced stages of spiritual development.

3. That the Buddhist council allegedly convened by Kanishka owed allegiance to Northern Buddhism is not a settled point.

4 The statement is somewhat obscure. May be Gandhi is here identifying `metaphysics' with ` ontology' and maintaining that early Buddhism in general and the *Abhidhamma Pitakas* in particular attached little importance to ontological investigations.

5. Abhidhammathasangaho, a standard manual of Theravada philosophy, would enumerate these 28 forms of matter as follows:

1-4 *Pathvidhatu, Apodhatu, Taijodhatu, Vayodhatu,* (collectively known as *Bhootrupan.*

5-9 *Chakkhu, Sotan, Dhanan, Jivah, Kayo* (collectively known as *Godhar*

10-14 *Gandho, Rakho, Photaban* (collectively known as *Gocharroopan.*

15-16 *Purisatan, Ithitan* (collectively known as *Bhavroopan.*

17 *Hridyavathu* (i.e. *Hridyaroopan*)

18 *Jeevitindryan* (*Jeevitroopan*)

19 *Akasdhatu,* (i.e. *Parichaidrupan*)

20-21 *Kayavinti, Vachivinti* (i.e. *Vintiroopan)*

22-28 *Roopas Lahuta, Muduta, Kambanta* (collectively known as *Vikarroopan*),

(*Roopras upcheyo, Santati, Jarta, Avichta* (collectively known as *Lakkhan·roopan*)

However, Abhidhammathasangaho tell us that *Phottaban* is not a separate form of matter but stands for the collectivity of *Pathvidhatu* and *Taijodhatu, Vayodhatu*. On the other hand, it enumerates an additional form of matter called *Kavleecharo aharo i.e. Aharroopan* - meaning `the food consumed'. Hence the number of forms remains 28 in both lists.

6. In the language of abhidhammathasngaho, they will be *Atvadupadanan, Kanupadanan, Dithupadanan,* and *Seelavyatupadanan.*

7. In the Abhidhammathasangaho, these seven `jewels' are described under the title *Vodhipakkhiysangho* and as follows

1. *Chataro Satipadvana*
2. *Chataro Sampadhano*
3. *Chataro Idhipada*
4. *Panch balani*
5. *Panchindryani*
6. *Satbojhaga*
7. *Atth Mangangani*

Gandhi's separate enumeration of these seven also follows that of this text. However, instead of saying "The five moral powers and five organs of spiritual sense are faith etc." he should say " The five moral powers, five organs of spiritual sense and seven kinds of wisdom are faith etc." again, this list beginning with `faith' should contain 9 rather than 8 entries, an English equivalent of *Prgya* (s.k.t.) coming after contemplation. The fact is that `faith, energy, thought, contemplation and *Prgya* are both the five moral powers and the five organs of spiritual sense while the seven kinds of wisdom are `energy, thought, contemplation, investigation, joy, repose, serenity.'

8. In the language of Abhidhammathasangaho *Dassanyojnani*.

VII

JAINISM

1. For this, the last lecture of the course, the subject that I have selected is Jainism, and I shall condense as much as possible the things that might be said on the subject.

Any philosophy or religion must be studied from all standpoints, and in order thoroughly, know what it says with regard to the origin of the universe, what its idea is with regard to God, with regard to the soul and its destiny, and what it regards as the laws of the soul's life. The answers to all these questions would collectively give us a true idea of the religion or philosophy. In our country religion is not different from philosophy, and religion and philosophy do not differ from science. We do not say that there is scientific religion or religious science; we say that the two are identical. We do not use the word religion because it implies a binding back and conveys and idea of dependence, the dependence of finite being upon an infinite, and [the idea that] in that dependence consists the happiness or bliss of the individual.[1] With the Jainas the idea is a little different. With them bliss consists not in dependence but in independence; the dependence is in the life of the world and if that life of the world is a part of religion then we may express the idea by the English word, but the life which is the highest life, is that in which we are personally independent, so far as binding or disturbing influences are concerned. In the Highest State the soul, which is the highest entity, is independent.

2. This is the idea of our religion. The first important idea connected with it is the idea of universe. Is it eternal or non-eternal? Is it permanent or transitory? Or course, there are so many different opinions on the subject, but with these opinions I am not concerned in this lecture; I am only going to give the idea of the Jaina philosophy.

We say that we cannot study any idea unless we look upon it from all standpoints. We may express this idea by symbols or forms; we have expressed it by the story of the elephant and the seven blind men who wanted to know what kind of animal the elephant was, and each, touching a different part of the animal, understood its form in so many different ways and thereupon became dogmatic. If you wish to understand what kind of animal an elephant is, you must look upon it from all sides, and so it is with truth. Therefore we say that the universe from one standpoint is eternal and from another one-eternal. The totality of the universe taken as whole is eternal. It is a collection of many things. That collection contains the same particles every moment, therefore as collection it is eternal; but there are so many parts of that collection and so many entities in it, all of which have their different states which occur at different times and each part does not retain the same state at all times. There is change, there is destruction of any particular form, and a new form comes into existence; and therefore if we look upon the universe from this standpoint it is non-eternal. With this philosophy there is no idea, and no place for the idea, of creation out of nothing. That idea, really speaking, is not entertained by any right-thinking people. Even those who believe in creation believe from a different standpoint than this. It cannot come into existence out of nothing, but is an emanation coming out of something. The state only is created. This book in a sense is created because all its particles are put together, having been in a different state. The form of the book is created. There was a beginning of this book and there will be an end. In the same manner, with any form of matter, whether this form lasts for moments or for centuries, if there was beginning of this book and there will be an end. In the same manner, with any form of matter, whether this form lasts for moments or for centuries, if there was a beginning there must be an end.

We say there are both preservation and destruction in the many forces working around us all these forces are working ever moment in the midst of us and around us, and the collection of these entities is called by the Jainas `God'.[2] The Brahman Represent it by the syllable OM; the first sound in this word represents the idea of creation, the second of preservation and the third of destruction. All these are energies of the universe and taken as a whole they are subject to certain fixed laws. If the law are fixed why do people bow down to these energies? Why do they consider the collective energy as a god or as God? There is always an idea of the power to do evil in the beginning of this conception. When railroads were first introduced into India ignorant people who did not know what they were, who had never seen in their lives that a car or carriage could be moved without the horse or the ox, thought that there was some divinity in the engine, some God or Goddess. and some of them even bow down before the car; and even to this day you will find in some parts of India, among the pariahs or low class, that there are people who entertain this idea. So to these energies in our primitive state we are liable to attribute personality; and after a long course of development we symbolize our thought in the form of pictures and explain them in that way to make them more intelligible to others. In the ancient times there was not rain but a rainer, not thunder but a thunderer, and in that way, personality is attributed, or living consciousness and character, to those forces. There may be conscious

entities in these forces, as there may be living entities on the planets, but these forces themselves are not living entities. This, however, expresses the idea in the beginning; these energies were classed as creative, preservative and destructive, and these three entities were considered to be component parts of one entity called Brahma by the Hindus. Really, creation in this is in the sense of emanation, preservation is used in the sense of preserving the form, and destruction in the sense of destroying the form.

The idea of matter is something that can be handled or perceived by the senses and the energies must be material energies, as cohesion, magnetism, electricity, but to consider these God would be the most materialistic idea, and therefore the Jainas discard this idea so far as the Godhead or Godlike character is concerned. They of course admit the existence of these energies, that they are indeed to be found everywhere, but they are subject to fixed laws which cannot be interfered with by any person, not that these energies consciously influence our destinies with regard to good and evil. To say that they do so influence us is only to show our ignorance with regard to their laws. These energies collectively we call substantiality. There are innumerable qualities and attributes in matter itself, and they manifest themselves at different times and ways. We are not able selves at different times and ways. We are not able without further development to know what energies are inherent in matter, and when any new thing comes to view we are surprised, and whatever is surprising is considered to be something coming from divinity; but where we understand scientific principles the surprise is removed and it is all as simple as the daily rising and setting of the sun. Thousands of years ago the different phenomena of nature were considered in different parts of the world to be the working of different Gods and Goddesses, but when we understand science these phenomena become simple and the idea of theses beings as characters of the highest spiritual power goes away.

3. `What is the God of the Jainas?' you will ask. I have only told you what he is not. I will now tell you what it is. We know that there is something besides matter; we know that the body exhibits many qualities and powers not to be found in ordinary material substances, and that the some thing which causes this, departs from the body at death. We do not know where it goes; we know that when it lives in the body the powers of the body are different from what they are when it is not there. The powers of nature can be assimilated to the body at death. We do not know where it goes; we know that when it lives in the body the powers of the body are different from what they are when it is not there. The powers of nature can be assimilated to the body when that some thing is there. That entity is considered by us the highest and it is the same inherently in all living beings. This principle common to us all is called divinity. It is not fully developed in any of us, as it was in the saviors of the world, and therefore we can them divine beings. So the collective idea derived from observations of the divine character inherent in all beings is by us called God. While there are so many energies in the material world and in the spiritual and putting those two energies together we give them the name of nature we separate the material energies and put them together; but the spiritual energies we put together and call them collectively God. We make a distinction and worship only the spiritual energies. Why

should we do so? A Jaina verse says, " I bow down to that spiritual power or energy which is the cause of leading us to the path of salvation, which is supreme, which is omniscient; I bow down to the power because I with to become like that power." So where the form of the Jaina prayer is given the object is not a receive anything from that entity or from that spiritual nature, but to become like that power." So where the form of the Jaina prayer is given the object is not to receive any thing from that entity or from that spiritual nature, but to become one like that; not that spiritual entity will make us, by a magic power, become like itself, but by following out the ideal which is before our eyes, we shall be able to change our own personality; it will be regretted, as it were, and will be changed into a being which will have the same character s the divinity which is our idea of God. So we worship God, not as being who is going to give up something, not because it is going to do something or please us, not because it is profitable in way; there is not any idea of selfishness; it is like practicing virtue for the sake of virtue and without any other motive.

4. (a) Now we come to the idea of soul. The ordinary idea of soul substance is that in order for thing to exist it must have formed, it must be perceived by the senses. This is our ordinary experience. Really speaking it is the experience only of the sensuous part of the being, the lowest part of the human entity, and from and experience we derive conclusions and think that these conclusions apply to all substance. There are substances, which cannot be perceived by the senses; there are subtler substances and entities and these can be known only by the consciousness, by the soul. Such a substance which cannot be seen, heard, tasted, smelt or touched, is a substance which need not occupy space and need not have any tangibility, but, it may exist although it may not have nay form.[3] Sight is an impression made on the nerves of the eye by vibrations sent forth form the object perceived and this impression which we call sight, if there are no vibrations coming out of the object, is of course not produced; but if this substance influences us in certain ways the implication is that there is something moving or producing vibrations, and these cannot exist unless there is some material substance which is vibrating. The very fact that something is moving in some way and influences us in some peculiar way implies that there is something material about this. If there are no vibrations the substance is not material. It need not exist in a form, which will give us the impression of any color, smell, etc. There is nothing, which can partake both the attributes of soul and of matter; the attributes of matter are directly contrary to those of the soul. While one has its life in the other, it does not become the other.

How can that soul live in matter when its attributes are of a different nature? By our own experience we know that, we are obliged to live in surrounding which are not congenial to us, Which are not of our own nature. People feel that they are not related to their surroundings, there must be some reason for their being obliged to live in those surroundings, but there must be a reason in the intelligence itself; it cannot be in the material substance. We know that this is fact, because intelligence cannot proceed from any thing, which is purely material. No material substance has given any evidence of having possessed intelligence; it might have done so when there was life in it, but without

this it has no intelligence.[4] That intelligence is, we are quite sure, influenced by material things, but it does not arise from the material things. Persons of sound intelligence take a large dose of some intoxicating drink and the intelligence will not work at all. Why should this material thing influence the immaterial, the soul? The soul thinks that the body is itself and therefore anything, which is done to the material self, is supposed by the real self to be done to it. That is where the Christian scientists and the Jaina philosophy will agree; that if the soul thinks that the body is real self anything done to the body will be considered by the soul to be done to the soul, and therefore what happens to the body will be felt by the soul; but if the soul for a moment thinks that the body is not the self but altogether different and a stranger to the soul, for that reason no feeling of pain will exist; our attention is taken away in some other direction shows that the self is something higher than the body. Still under ordinary circumstances the soul is influenced by the body, and therefore we are to study the laws of the body and soul so as to rise above these little things and proceed on our path to salvation or liberation, which is the real aspiration of the soul. There is power of matter itself, but that power is lower than the power of the soul. If there was no power at all in the body or in matter, the soul would never be influenced by it, for mere non-existence will never influence anything; but because there is such a thing as matter when the soul thinks that that the soul would never be influenced by it, for mere non-existence will never influence anything; but because there is such a thing as matter, when the soul thinks that there is a power of the body and a power of the matter, these powers will influence it. Bodily power as we see it is on account of the presence of the soul. There is a power in matter, as cohesion etc, and this will work although the soul does not think anything about it. If the moon revolves around the earth there are some forces inherent in the earth and moon. What I mean to say is that the influence of these material powers on soul powers depends on the soul's readiness or willingness to submit to these powers. If the soul takes the view that it will not be influenced by any thing, it cannot be so influences.

(b) This being the soul's nature, what is its origin? Everything can be looked upon from two standpoints, the substance and the manifestation. If the state of the soul itself is to be taken into consideration that state has its beginning and its end. The state of the soul as living in the human body had a beginning at birth and will have an end at death, but it is a beginning and an end of the state, not of the thing itself. The soul taken as a substance is eternal; taken as a state every state has its beginning and end. So this beginning of a state implies that before this beginning there was another state of the soul. Nothing can exist unless it exists in some state. The state may not be permanent, but the thing must have a state at all times. if therefore the present state of the soul had beginning, it had another state before the beginning of this state, and after the end of this state it will have another state. So the future state is something that comes out of or is the result of the present state. As the future is to the present, so the present is to the past. The present is only the future of the past. What is true with regard to the future state is true with regard to the past and present state. The acts of the past have determined our present state, and if this is true the acts of the present state must determine the future state.

This brings us to the doctrine of rebirth, transmigration of souls, metempsychosis, reincarnation, etc. as they are variously known. First take incarnation, which means literally becoming flesh; and, really that which is spirit is always spirit or soul. The spirit does not become flesh. If reincarnation means to become flesh there can be no reincarnation, but if it means simply the life in flesh for a short time, then there is reincarnation. Reincarnation means also to be born in some state again and again. Metempsychosis means in Greek only change; that the animal itself, body and soul, everything together, is changed into some other thing and so on. That is the idea of metempsychosis. Transmigration of souls is, especially in the idea of the Christians, the idea of the human soul going into the animal body, as if this were a necessity. But that is not the real idea; the real idea is simply going from one place to another or from one body to another, but not necessarily going from the human body to the animal body, but simply travelling. It implies the idea of form. Nothing can travel unless it has form and occupies space and is material; so in our philosophy we reject all these terms if that is the idea connected with these terms, and use the idea of rebirth; that is, the soul is born in some other body, and the birth does not imply the same conditions [as those] applying to the human birth[6]. There are certain conditions in which human beings are born; the seed itself takes several months to ripen and then there is the birth. This may be due to certain acts or forces, which are generated by human beings?[7] These are in a condition to be observed by beings whose forces will take them to some other planet, and we say that there is another condition of birth there. There is no necessity for gestation and fecundation. The karmic body has in itself many powers and has a force to take to itself another body, which is in the case of the human beings a gross body, but in the case of other beings a subtle body is generated and this body is changeable so far as its form and dimensions are concerned. Therefore, if the forces generated, while we live any kind of life are of different kinds then in the case of some being it may be necessary that he should be born in the human condition and pass through the actual conditions which must be obeyed if the human being is to be born, while if the forces generated are different in their character he may be born on some other planet, where birth is manifested in different way, without any necessity of the combination of the male and the female principle. There are so many different planes of life that the mere study of the human life ought not to be made to apply to all the affairs of life. We have studied only a few forms of the life of animals, human beings, etc., but that is only the part which under the present development of our science of our eyesight even, we are able to study. We are not able to study other forms of life, innumerable in the universe, and therefore we ought not to apply the laws thus discovered to all forms of life.

Our study is introspective because our idea is that soul is able to know everything under the right circumstances. The knowledge acquired under these conditions is of the sounder nature and a more correct kind because the obstacles, which come in the way science, are not there. Science has to commit mistakes and think that they do not;[8] still knowledge is derived from inferences which we draw from certain premises which may not be right or if the premises are right the inference may be wrong. We do not mean to say that there are

always mistakes in the knowledge, which is acquired through sensation or through matter, but sometimes it is possible, and while it may be correct knowledge in many cases we cannot rely on that. The highest knowledge is immediate knowledge, derived by the soul without the assistance of any external thing, and the knowledge of liberated souls, and also the knowledge of human beings who are just on the point of being liberated, or have passed through the course of discipline, mental, moral and spiritual, and have nearly exhausted past forces, at the same time generating spiritual forces, and on account of discipline and sees everything when this state is arrived at; it knows means that it is something, some reality, and there can be no reality unless it can distinguish itself from other realities. Only the one universal thing could not know itself, because knowledge implies comparing one with another, and if that itself, because knowledge implies comparing one with another, and if that is not done there is no individuality. We say therefore that the soul in its highest existence knows, that it is perfectly separate form other things, so far as experience and knowledge are concerned, but in so far as its nature is concerned, so long as there is a sense of separateness, there is no occasion or opportunity for the soul to rise higher because when the soul thinks that it is living a different existence for its own sake it is considering its own self to be different from another person and thinks that this is its own and a part of its nature, its own being, and therefore anything done in regard to these surroundings will benefit or injure its own.[9] It even thinks that its very life consists in doing goods and in loving other souls and taking active measures for carrying into effect the very plan of the sole (Those souls?). Then it comes higher, and ultimately reaches the highest condition. The condition of the soul, as I have said, is the highest in which there is perfect consciousness, there is infinite knowledge and infinite bliss; we express these three ideas in Sanskrit as existence infinite, bliss infinite and knowledge infinite. That condition of the soul cannot be described by us because description is something which proceeds from a finite mind and when the soul becomes infinite no finite mind and when the soul becomes infinite no finite mind can fully express the conditions of that infinite state. The attributes we give therefore to that condition of the soul are always full of comprehension.[10]We shall always leave out many things; we have not the power to express all our thoughts. How can we express, then, this state of a soul, which so far as its power and knowledge are concerned is infinite?

The Jainas have studied the nature of the soul and the universe from these standpoints and have derived a beautiful principle, and so far as this is concerned there is this difference between this country and other countries and other religions, they can understand all these from these standpoints[11]. The Bible says, 'Thou shalt not kill', and Jainas practice universal love so that this also means that we should not kill any beings. If we say that the Bible does not mean that we take away a part of the bible. Why should we interpret the laws of any religion from the narrowest standpoint? We should take into consideration the nature, attributes and working of all things. We cannot derive laws, which are to be applied to the whole universe simply by our observation of a part of the conscious nature of the universe. If you wish to state correctly the nature of the universe you will study the nature of all the different parts of the universe and then the laws will be applicable to all parts of it. We think that we are superior to other things because our tenants who live on the ground floor

are inferior to us, but we have no right therefore to crush those tenants, who later on will acquire the right to inhabit the second and third floors and finally the highest floor. One living on the highest plane has no right to crush those who live on the lowest plane. If one thinks that he has a right to do this, which he has, not sufficient strength to live without destroying life, our philosophy says that it is still sin to destroy life, and it remains only to choose the lowest form, the less evil, We will in business take such a kind of business as will yield the most profit and will cause us to lose the least, in which we have the less liabilities; and the highest condition will be that in which we have no liabilities and no creditors, the state in which we may live without any creditors or in a perfectly free condition. That is the liberated condition.

5. The idea of *Karma* is very complicated. I have told you something so it in my former lectures. The one chief point is that that theory is not the theory of fatalism, not a theory in which the human being is tied down to some, one, bound down by the force of something outside itself. In one sense only will there be fatalism; if we are free to do many things we are also not free to do other things, and we cannot be freed from and results of our acts. Some results may be manifested in great strength, others very weakly; some may take a very long time and others a very short time; some are of such a nature that they take a long time to work out, while the influence of others may be removed by simply washing with water and that will be the case in the matter of acts done incidentally without any settled purpose or any fixed desire. In such a case with reference to many acts we may counteract their effects by willing to do so. So the theory of *karma* is not in any sense a theory of fatalism, but we say that all of us are not going to one goal without any desire on our part, not that we are to reach that state without any effort on our part, but that our present condition is the effect of our acts, thoughts and words in the past state.[12] To say that all will reach the prefect state merely because some one has died that they might be saved, merely from a belief in this person, would be a theory of fatalism, because those who have lived a pure and virtuous state and have not accepted a certain theory will not reach the perfected state simply for that reason and no other the faith in saviors is simply this, that by following out the divine principle which is in our selves when this is fully developed we also shall become Christ's, by the crucifixion of the lower nature on the altar of the higher. We also use the cross as a symbol. All living beings have to pass through or evolve from the lowest, the monadic, condition to the highest state of existence and cannot reach this unless they obtain possession of the three things necessary; right belief, right knowledge and right conduct. The right, belief, really speaking, is not that there is no passing through forms after death, but the soul keeps progressing always in its own nature without any backward direction at all[13]. We have expressed this in clear language without any parables or metaphors, but when we preach these truths to the ignorant masses some story or picture might be necessary for them and after that the explanation of the real meaning; as well have all allegory in the Pilgrim's Progress. It is just like reaching the Celestial City in that book, but we must all understand that these things are parables. Others may need music to assist their religion, but when we understand the esoteric meaning which underlies all religion there will be no quarrelling and no need of names or of forms; and

this is really the object of all religions.

REFERENCES:

1. The sentence makes sense only as thus completed. Gandhi seems to be basing his argument on the etymological derivation of the word `religion'.

2. This statement is anomalous, for it is precisely Gandhi's argument that the material energies manifested there in the universe are not treated as `God' in Jaina philosophy. Nor can it be said that Gandhi here means to refer to the `spiritual energies' which, as we shall learn in the next section, are actually treated as `God' in Jaina philosophy. For in the present section Gandhi is confining his attention to the material sector of the universe.

3. That soul does not occupy space only means that it is not something physical; for strictly speaking, the Jaina does maintain that there obtains some sort of relationship between the substance called `soul' and that called `space'. The printed text here contains some bracketed material but that is redundant.

4. This statement is worded somewhat loosely; for according to the Jaina, even when occupied by soul the body done not come to possess intelligence; what it becomes then is an `instrument of the intelligent activities undertake by soul'.

5. `Christian Science' was a prevalent Western cult of Gandhi's days According to it, the physical bodies possess no real reality, the only real realities being the souls. Gandhi agrees with this view only to the extent that according to him too the physical body does not influence that soul which refuses to be influenced by this body but not to the extent of denying the very reality of the physical body.

6. This sentence needs some correction of the type here suggested.

7. Here the phrase `generated by human beings' means `generated by those *karmic* bodies which are going to take to themselves a human body,' This becomes clear from the immediately forthcoming part of Gandhi's argument

8. It is not possible to correct this part of the sentence, but it must be pointing out something that Gandhi considers to be a shortcoming of scientific knowledge.

9. The exact import of the argument Gandhi adduces in this sentence and the next is not quite clear. May be he is distinguishing between the `sense of separateness' felt by one who

is enlightened and the felt by one who is not, further subdividing the latter into the `sense of separateness' felt by one who is of a `self-regarding' disposition and that felt by one who is of an `other regarding' disposition.

10. The phrase `full of comprehension' means `full of implied meanings'.

11. Here "they" might stand for `Jainas' or for `this country (i.e. India) and its religions'. Maybe some words are missing in this sentence.

12. This sentence will give a clearer meaning if "we say that all of us are not going...." is read as "we do not say that all of us are going...

13. The meaning of this sentence is not quite clear. May be Gandhi is saying that the possession of `right belief' dose not rule out the possibility of future birth but that it does rule out the possibility of a future degeneration.

SANSKRIT TERMS

Agnihotr	
Achit	Matter
Atvad	Doctrine of soul
Adhirm	Demerit
Anuman	Inference
Anteryamee	Ishwar
Antakaran	Internal instrument
Apratv	Posteriority
Aparvag	Emancipation
Apas	Water
Abhan	Unmanr

Abhav	Non-existence
Abhinivaish	Dissolution
Abhyasa	Constant practice
Arth	Object of sense
Avyav	Argument of the objector split up
Avasthaprin.am	Condition-transformation
Avidya	Ignorance
Avyakt	non-evolved
ahankara	Egoism
Asmita	Egoism
Akash	Ether
Akunchan	Contraction
Atma	Soul
Asan	Posture
Ichha	Desire
Indriyas	Organs
Ishwar	God
Utkshaipan	Elevation
Udaish	Mention
Upadan	Material cause
Upadhi	Adjunct

Upasak	Worship
Aeshwarya	Supernatural power
Karma	Action
Karma kand	Work portion
Kalpa	World period
Karan'avastha	Causal condition
Karyavastha	Condition of effect
Kal	Time
Kaivalya	Final Emancipation
Gandha	Odor
Gaman	Motion
Gun¨	Quality
Gurutva	Gravity
Chit	Individual soul
Caitanya	Pure intelligence
Chal	Quibbling artifices
Jal	Water
Jalpa	Wrangling
Jati	Futile replies
Jeev	Personal soul
Tanmatr	Five subtle elements
Tama's	Darkness

Tark	Refutation
Tarakgyan	Intuitive knowledge
Trishṅa	Thirst
Taijasa	Light, Fire
Dick	Space
Drishtant	Familiar example
Drvatv	Fluidity
Dravya	Substance
Dvaish	Aversion
Dukkh	Pain
Dharma	Merit
Dharmpariṅam	Property transformation
Dharaṅa	Restraint
Dhyan	Absorption
Nad	Sound
Nar̈ee	Vehicles of Praṅa
Nabhichakr	Navel Chakr
Nidra	Sleep
Nirodhpriṅam	Transfer of the mind into interceptions
Nirṅay	Conclusion
Pratv	Priority

Parmatman	Highest self
Parin·am	Change
Pariman·	Dimension
Priksha	Examination of definition
Pitryan	Road of fathers
Purush	Intelligence
Prithvee	Earth
Prkar	Modes
Prakriti	Matter
Prakriti	Matter
Prteek	An aspect
Prtyaksh	Perception
Pratyahar	Abstraction
Prma	Right measures
Prman·	Evidence
Prmaiy	Subjects of right knowledge
Pryatn	Volition
Prvriti	Activity
Pran·ayam	Exercises of breadth
Praityabhav	Transmigration
Phal	Consequences
Buddhi	Intellect

Manas	Mind
Mukti	Liberation
Yam	Forbearance
Rajas	Activity
Ras	Taste
Rag	Attachment
Roop	color
Lakshaṇ	Differentia
Lakshaṇpriṇam	Character
Vayu	Air
Vikalp	Chimera
Vikas	Expansion
Vigyan	Knowledge
Vitanda	Caviling
Vipreya	Misprision
Vishaish	Variety
Vihar	Monastery
Vriti	Transformation
Vaidana	Sensations
Vairagya	Dispassion
Hinsa	Killing

Haitvabhas	Fallacious Reasoning
Satv	Purity
Samanya	Uniformity
Sukha	Pleasure
Sushumṅa	Middle course
Sanskar	Potentiality
Sansara	Endless cycle of birth
Skandh	Aggregate
Sangya	Name
Sthoolbhoot	Gross elements
Sthoolshreer	Gross body
Snaih	Viscidity
Spirsh	Tangibility
Smriti	Memory
Svkirm	Fulfillment of duties
Shabda	Sound
Shreer	Body
Gyan	Knowledge
Gyankand	knowledge portion